265.6
L462h
v.3

BX2265 .L42 1896
v.3
Lea, Henry Charles,
1825-1909.
A history of auricular
confession and indulgences
in the Latin church

A HISTORY

OF

AURICULAR CONFESSION

AND

INDULGENCES

IN THE LATIN CHURCH.

BY

HENRY CHARLES LEA, LL.D.

IN THREE VOLUMES.

VOLUME III.

INDULGENCES.

PHILADELPHIA:
LEA BROTHERS & CO.
1896.

Z65.6
L462h
v.3

Entered according to the Act of Congress, in the year 1896, by
HENRY CHARLES LEA,
In the Office of the Librarian of Congress. All rights reserved.

41117

PHILADELPHIA:
DORNAN, PRINTER.

CONTENTS.

PART II.

INDULGENCES.

CHAPTER I.—General Theories.

	PAGE
Pre-Tridentine Admission of Late Origin of Indulgences	3
Modern Assertion of Apostolic Origin	4
Various Hypotheses to Substantiate the Claim	5
Indulgences Arose from Commutation and Redemption of Penance	9
Special Indulgences Granted by Priests	11
General Indulgences Granted by Bishops	13
The Doctrine of the Treasure of the Church	14
The Communion of Saints	15
Letters of Fraternity	17
The Treasure First Suggested by Alexander Hales	21
Accepted by Clement VI. in 1343	24
Debates as to the Nature of the Treasure	25
Indulgences Become a Payment to God out of the Treasure	27
They are a Matter of Jurisdiction and not of Orders	28
They Supply all Deficiencies of Penance, *injuncta* and *injungenda*	31
They Become the Exclusive Function of the Pope	36
They are a Remission of Punishment, not of Guilt	39
Promises of Comparative and Superlative Indulgences	40
Discussion as to their Efficacy	43
Intricate Disputed Questions	52
Claim that Indulgences Relieve from Guilt as well as from Punishment	54
Pre-Reformation Tendency to Admit Indulgences *a culpa*	67
Modern Explanation of Indulgences *a culpa et a pœna*	79

PAGE
Sins Committed in Expectation of Indulgence 83
Partial Indulgences, their Computation 85
Their Cumulation 91
Toties Quoties Indulgences 92

CHAPTER II.—Requisites for Indulgences.

Sufficiency of Cause 96
Sufficiency of Works Enjoined 101
Consent of the Confessor 105
State of Grace of the Penitent 106
Disposition of the Penitent 113
Performance of Enjoined Works 116
Intention of the Penitent 119
Uncertainty of Acquisition of Indulgences 121
Release from Performance of Penance 122

CHAPTER III.—Development.

Modern Claims of Early Indulgences 131
Fraudulent Early Indulgences 133
Commencement in Eleventh Century 141
Slow Development 143
Extreme Moderation until the Fourteenth Century . . . 145
Indulgences at the Canonization of Saints 150
Influence of the Crusades 152
Commutations for Money—The Cruzada 154
Episcopal Indulgences—Restrictions Placed on Bishops . . 162
Restrictions Released at the Death-Bed 167
Cardinals and Legates 168
Power of General Councils to Grant Indulgences 169
Evasions of Episcopal Limitations—Cumulation of Indulgences . 170
Objects of Indulgences 177
Money the Principal Object 179
Sale of Concessions 182
Spiritual Objects 184
Charitable Objects 188
Personal Indulgences 191
Release from Obligation of Fasting—*Butterbriefe* 192

CHAPTER IV.—The Jubilee.

PAGE
Rome as an Object of Pilgrimage 195
Boniface VIII. Offers Plenary Indulgences in 1300 . . . 199
The Jubilee of 1350 202
The Jubilee of 1390—Sales Throughout the Lands of Roman Obedience 206
The Jubilee of 1423 208
The Jubilee of 1450 209
The Jubilee of 1475 210
The Jubilee of 1500 212
Subsequent Jubilees 214
Suspension of Indulgences During Jubilees 219
of Indulgences for the Dead 225
Advantages of the Jubilee Indulgence 228
Extraordinary Jubilees—Almsgiving 231

CHAPTER V.—The Later Middle Ages.

Indulgences Lavished on the Religious Orders 234
The Portiuncula 236
The Carmelites 253
Their Scapular 263
The Sabbatine Bull 270
Increase of Indulgences 277
Enormous Partial Indulgences 279
Miscellaneous Objects of Indulgences 282
Methods of Sale—The Pardoners 284
Opposition Aroused 293

CHAPTER VI.—Application to the Dead.

Primitive Christian Eschatology 296
Growth of Belief in Purgatory 303
It is Accepted in the Twelfth Century 310
Time of Judgment of the Soul 315
Succor for the Dead 318
Mortuary Masses 326
Relief from Hell 329
Relief from Purgatory 334
Discussion as to Application of Indulgences to Souls in Purgatory 337

PAGE
The First Indulgence for the Dead in 1476 345
Gradual Extension of the Practice 351
Efficacy of Indulgences for the Dead 357
The State of Grace 360
Privileged Altars 364

CHAPTER VII.—The Reformation.

The Medieval Heresies 372
Orthodox Opposition 377
The St. Peter's Indulgence—Papal Necessities 379
Albert of Mainz—Tetzel 387
Luther's Gradual Development 390
Popular Enthusiasm in Luther's Favor—Hatred of Rome . . 396
German Demand for Reform 405
Papal Projects of Reform 409
The Indulgential System—The Spanish Cruzada 413

CHAPTER VIII.—The Counter-Reformation.

Reforms Attempted by Charles V. 417
Action of the Council of Trent 418
Slowness of Reform 423
The Modern Cruzada 425
Eleemosynary Indulgences 437
Multiplication of Indulgences 442
Episcopal Supervision 444

CHAPTER IX.—The Stations of Rome.

Attributed to Gregory I. 447
Growth of Roman Indulgences in the Fourteenth Century . . 448
Uncertainty of the Stations of Rome 450
Multiplicity of Indulgences of the Roman Churches . . . 452
The *Scala Santa* 457

CHAPTER X.—The Religious Orders.

Indulgences for Members of the Orders—The Tertiaries . . 460
Indulgences for the Churches 463
The *Via Crucis* 465

CHAPTER XI.—The Confraternities.

PAGE
The Confraternities of the Middle Ages 470
Reforms of Clement VIII. 477
Objects of Confraternities—Charity 481
Temporal Interests of the Church 483
Devotional Exercises—The Rosary 484
Confraternities Attached to Religious Orders 490
Confraternities for Special Cults 492
The Scapulars 496
Reduplication of Indulgences 500
The Veronica 501

CHAPTER XII.—Indulgenced Objects.

Origin in the Sixteenth Century 507
Rules as to Materials Employed 510
Prohibition of Transmission by Gift or Sale 512
Acquisition of Indulgences by Touching Holy Objects . . . 514
by Blessing 517
Medals and Crosses 519
Rosaries and Chaplets 523

CHAPTER XIII.—Modern Expansion.

Profusion of Modern Indulgences 528
Indulgences for Acts of Devotion 529
for Works of Mercy 534
for Political Objects 538
The Papal Benediction 541
Opposition of the Mystics 543
Futile Attempts of Reform 545

CHAPTER XIV.—Apocryphal Indulgences.

Prevalence of Forgeries—The Secular Churches 550
The Franciscans and Dominicans 553
The Other Regular Orders—The Jesuits 557
Failure of the Plan of Reform devised at Trent 558
Efforts of the Holy See.—The Congregation of Indulgences Organized 559

PAGE
Its Success only Partial—Duty of the Bishops 562
Persistent Longevity of Fraudulent Indulgences 564
Efficacy of Apocryphal Indulgences 567

CHAPTER XV.—Influence of Indulgences.

Diversity of Virtues Ascribed to Indulgences 569
Testimony as to their Demoralizing Influence 570
Effects on Assemblages Gathered to Obtain Them 575
Distinction Between Protestantism and Catholicism . . . 578
Relation Between God and Man in Catholicism 579
Influences of Indulgences in History 581
Retrospect of the Career of the Church 582

Appendix 585

Index of Part II. 597

PART II.

INDULGENCES.

INDULGENCES.

CHAPTER I.

GENERAL THEORIES.

Our survey of the resources of the Church in securing pardon for the sins of its children would be incomplete without some account of the indulgences which it distributes so freely. A system which aided largely in building up the autocracy of the Holy See and furnished it the means wherewith to establish its power as an Italian sovereign, which was the main-spring of the crusades, the proximate cause of the rebellion of John Huss and of the successful revolution of Luther, and which forms so prominent a part of Catholic observance to-day, is worthy of a more minute investigation than can be given to it here.

Prior to the council of Trent theologians had no hesitation in admitting that the Christian Fathers knew nothing of indulgences; there was, it is true, a baseless tradition ascribing to Gregory the Great an indulgence for visiting St. Peter's, but the strongest argument advanced in their support was that the Church issued them and would be deceiving the faithful if they were not valid.[1] The Blessed Fisher of Rochester even goes so far as to admit that the value of indulgences is wholly dependent on purgatory, and, as

[1] Durand de S. Porciano in IV. Sentt. Dist. xx. Q. iii. §§ 3, 4.—S. Antonini Summæ P. I. Tit. x. Cap. 3.—Summa Angelica s. v. *Indulgentia* § 18.—Summa Sylvestrina s. v. *Indulgentia*.—Jo. Eckii Enchirid. Locor. Commun. Cap. xxiv. *De Indulgentiis*. Aquinas only urges (Summæ Suppl. Q. xxv. Art. 1) that it is impious to assert that the Church does anything in vain, and Bonaventura argues (In IV. Sentt. Dist. xx. P. ii. Art. 1, Q. 2) that the Church accepts indulgences, the Church does not err, and therefore they can be granted. Dr. Weigel uses the same argument (Claviculæ Indulgent. Cap. xvi.), and points out that it is disputed only by Wickliffe and Huss, whose teachings were confirmed by no miracles.

purgatory was unknown, so were indulgences, until the refrigescence of Christian zeal rendered the severity of the canons unendurable, and men would rather abandon Christianity than submit to it.[1] In fact, the protagonists in the conflict with Lutheranism conceded that there was no point of Catholic doctrine so difficult to defend and so impossible to justify with proof.[2] Domingo Soto, about the middle of the sixteenth century, seems to be the first to meet the Lutheran assaults with the bold assertion that indulgences date from the time of the Apostles.[3]

This was evidently the only position which could be taken by an infallible Church involved in internecine strife with heretics, and in its final session the council of Trent felt compelled to assert that the power to grant indulgences was divinely conferred by Christ himself and that it had been exercised from the most ancient times.[4] This

[1] Jo. Roffensis Assertionis Lutheranæ Confutatio, Art. XVIII.

Stephanus ex Nottis not long before (Opus Remissionis fol. 147*a*, Mediolan. 1500) had attributed the absence of early evidence of indulgences to the fact that prior to Gregory the Great the Christians were so perfect that there was little need of such aids to salvation.

Cardinal Caietano, in controverting Luther, in 1517, admits that there is no mention of indulgences earlier than about three hundred years before.—Caietani Tract. XV. De Indulgentiis Cap. 1.

[2] Alfonso de Castro (Adv. Hæreses Lib. VIII. s. v. *Indulgentia*) says that of all the questions in dispute with the Lutherans there is none on which so little evidence can be adduced, but he adds that there are many things known to the moderns of which the Fathers were ignorant, such as transubstantiation, purgatory, and the procession of the Holy Ghost.

Pedro de Soto, who was chief papal theologian in the first convocation of the council of Trent, admits that there is no positive evidence in Scripture and the early Church, and warns disputants not to put forward uncertain proofs, for thus the evil-disposed are frequently enabled to deride the faith, and the simple are scandalized.—P. de Soto Instruct. Sacerd. Lect. I. De Indulgentiis (Amort de Indulg. I. 145).

[3] Dom. Soto in IV. Sentt. Dist. XXI. Artt. 1, 3.

[4] C. Trident. Sess. XXV. Contin. Decr. de Indulgent. "Quum potestas conferendi indulgentias a Christo Ecclesiæ concessa sit, atque hujusmodi potestate divinitus sibi tradita antiquissimis etiam temporibus illa usa fuerit."

Not content with this Val. Laur. Vidaviensis (Gen. Controvers. de Indulgent. Concl. 4) contends that indulgences have been in use since the creation (Amort de Indulg. II. 162).

Equally conclusive is the assertion of the learned Professor Gianbattista Pauliano, in a work prepared for the jubilee of 1550 (De Jobilæo et Indul-

assertion was accepted as *de fide*, and was embodied by Paul IV., in 1564, in a declaration of faith, the subscription to which is obligatory on all teachers and professors and students, under pain of forfeiture of position and grade, and on all beneficed clerks under penalty of loss of benefice, as provided by the council of Trent.[1] The necessary consequence of this has been to render it incumbent on all subsequent theologians to put forward some hypothesis that shall give a semblance of justification to the claim. It was discovered that in the case of the Corinthian sinner (II. Cor. ii. 8, 10) the confirmation by Paul of his pardon by the congregation was an indubitable indulgence.[2] Great reliance is placed, as proving the existence of indulgences, on the *libelli* given, during periods of persecution, by martyrs and confessors to the lapsed, interceding for their restoration to the peace of the Church.[3] Cyprian admitted that the intercession

---

gentiis, p. 52) who tells us that Moses striking the rock signifies contrition, and the water that flowed was indulgences.

[1] Pauli PP. IV. Bullæ *In sacrosancta, Injunctum*, 13 Nov. 1564 (Bullar. II. 137, 138). "Indulgentiarum etiam potestatem a Christo in Ecclesia relictam fuisse, illarumque usum Christiano populo maxime salutarem esse affirmo."—C. Trident. Sess. XXIV. De Reform. Cap. xii. The same clause is included in a confession of faith drawn up in 1575 by Gregory XIII. for subscription by the Greeks.—Gregor. PP. XIII. Concl. XXXIII. (Ibid. p. 430).

At the second session of the Vatican council, Jan. 6, 1870, all prelates were required to declare their adhesion to this confession of faith and pledge themselves to enforce it on their subjects.—Chambard, Annales Ecclésiastiques, I. 263. This I presume is customary. I find it in Concil. Limens. Prov. I. ann. 1583, and in Concil. Baltimorens. Plenar. II. (1866) and III. (1884).

[2] Alexander Hales (Summæ P. IV. Q. XXIII. Membr. 2) proves dialectically that the pardon of the Corinthian sinner was not an indulgence. It is universally advanced as such by the apologists (Amort de Indulg. I. 28; Gröne der Ablass seine Geschichte u. Bedeutung, pp. 1, 2; Binterim, Denkwürdigkeiten, V. III. 448). Prierias (Summa Sylvestrina s. v. *Indulgentia*) admits that it is cited by modern doctors and not by the older ones.

In the authorized Catholic version of the Testament there is a note appended to this text explaining that "The apostle here granted an indulgence or pardon in the person and by the authority of Christ to the incestuous Corinthian whom before he had put under penance, which pardon consisted in a releasing of part of the temporal punishment due to his sin"—a typical instance of the facility with which men read into Scripture whatever they desire to find there.

[3] Euseb. H. E. Lib. v. Cap. 2.—Tertull. ad Martyras Cap. 1.—Tertullian even

of the martyrs might have influence with God, but he refused to accept it as conferring reconciliation with the Church and serving as a substitute for penance (except in the case of the sick in danger of death), and in this he was sustained by the Roman clergy.[1] As the indulgence has no power over *culpa*, but is merely a substitute for the *pœna*, it will be seen how completely Cyprian rejected any claim of the *libelli* to rank with the modern conception of the indulgence, and this distinction is clearly shown in the application of Celerinus from Rome to the confessor Lucianus in Carthage, asking him to procure the intercession of the martyrs, not with any bishop for remission of penance, but with Christ for pardon, in behalf of his sisters, Numeria and Candida, who had lapsed—an application which moreover shows that at Rome the martyrs were not issuing *libelli*.[2] In Egypt this interposition of the martyrs in favor of the lapsed was not customary, for when, during the same persecution, they admitted to association with themselves some of the penitent lapsed, St. Dionysius of Alexandria wrote to Fabius of Antioch asking his advice whether or not to confirm this act of mercy, showing that the question was new to him.[3] What conclusion was reached we do not know, but it is significant that, some half a century later, under the persecution of Diocletian, in 305, Peter of Alexandria makes no reference to the intercession of martyrs in his elaborate instructions

---

says (De Pudicit, Cap. 22) that men had themselves imprisoned in order to sell *libelli* to adulterers and sinners.

For the arguments drawn from this see Bouvier, Traité des Indulgences Ch. II. Art. 3.—Green, Indulgences, Absolutions etc. p. 27 (London, 1872).—Amort de Indulgentiis I. 29–31.—Jouhanneaud, Dict. des Indulgences, p. 150 (Paris, Migne, 1862).—Binterim (Denkwürdigkeiten, V. II. 321–7, 449–50) contradicts himself completely. Henriquez (Summæ Theol. Moral. Lib. VII. Cap. iii. § 2), after asserting that indulgences are coeval with the apostles, passes over Cyprian and discovers that St. Isidor of Seville granted an indulgence of forty days, but unfortunately gives us no authority for the fact.

[1] Cypriani de Lapsis; Epistt. XVIII. XIX. XX. XXII. XXIII. XXV. XXVI. XXVII. XXX. XXXI. (Ed. Oxon.).—An illustration of the manner in which these facts are distorted by modern apologists is seen in the assertion of Gröne (Der Ablass, p. 165) that Cyprian's position shows that the indulgences of the martyrs reconciled the lapsed to God as completely as works of satisfaction.

[2] Cypriani Epist. XXI. Lucianus issued *libelli* by wholesale in the name of Paulus, a martyr, who, he said, had authorized him to do so (Epist. XXII. XXVII.).

[3] Euseb. H. E. Lib. VI. Cap. 42.

for the reconciliation of the lapsed.[1] Whatever weight such intercession might have had was a local and temporary fashion, the abuse of which led to its discontinuance.

Another school, represented by Muzzarelli, who recognize that the ancient penance and reconciliation were not sacramental, but only efficient in the *forum externum*, are obliged to argue that, in addition to them, there was administered a sacramental absolution, reconciling the sinner to God, of which no trace has reached us; thus, as indulgences are recorded in the eleventh century, they consider it safe to assume that they must have existed before, and in this way they seek to justify the assertion of the council of Trent. Yet Muzzarelli subsequently admits the Tridentine assertion to be indefensible when he argues that God provided three methods for the remission of sin —the prolonged penance of the early Church, the sacrament, and the indulgence, which it was his will to employ successively—the first during the ages of ardent charity, the second when that charity became cooler, and the third when it has been almost completely chilled.[2]

A variant of Muzzarelli's first theory is advanced by the learned Dr. Amort, who, in 1732, suggested that, in the ancient form of penance, imposed on Ash Wednesday, followed by reconciliation on some subsequent Holy Thursday, the priest in the former ceremony absolved the penitent, and that the reconciliation by the bishop was an indulgence.[3] Of course, this is a flight of pure imagination. No

---

[1] S. Petri Alexandr. Canones (Mag. Biblioth. Patrum III. 370).

Peter, however, goes even further than Cyprian, and admits (Can. 11) that sometimes remission of sin and bodily health and the resurrection of the dead can be obtained through the faith of another.

[2] Jouhanneaud, Dictionnaire des Indulgences, pp. 127–30.

Muzzarelli was a papal Penitentiary, and his work was in some sort an official defence of indulgences against the assaults of the Pistoia school.

[3] Amort de Indulgentiis I. 3. Dr. Amort seems to imagine (Ibid. p. 32) that any canon prescribing penance infers an indulgence.

In the approbations given by the papal authorities to this work it is eulogized in the warmest manner as an inexhaustible armory for repelling the assaults of heretics. It is a monument of immense labor. The author states that in its preparation he ransacked fifty libraries and examined several thousand MSS., besides reading at least a thousand authors who had written on the subject. It will be seen that I am occasionally indebted to it for reference to works which I have not been able to consult directly.

contemporary writer, while yet the formula of this public penance was in force, from the early centuries to the later middle ages, ever suggested that the sack-cloth and ashes of Ash Wednesday were accompanied with absolution—in fact, as the rite itself shows, it was ejection from the Church, the very reverse of absolution, and, during the long periods of penance which followed, the penitent was debarred from communion, which could not have been refused to him had he been absolved.[1] Even when, under the Penitentials, sinners were admitted to communion after half their penance had expired, this did not release them from the other half. It is the same as regards the Holy Thursday reconciliation; the schoolmen were quite keen enough to recognize its connection with indulgences had such connection existed, yet none of them allude to the slightest relationship between them in their labored attempts to fit in the novel practice to the sacramental system which they were elaborating. In fact, it was their belief that to be sacramental the sacrament of penance must be administered in secret,[2] and the Holy Thursday reconciliation by no means inferred that penance was not to be continued.[3] The only importance of Dr. Amort's hypothesis, in fact, is the evidence which it affords of the straits to which theologians are reduced in the endeavor to reconcile the Tridentine assertion with the facts, and yet Palmieri, in his efforts to prove the antiquity of indulgences, is obliged to adopt it.[4]

Other writers see in the intercessory powers claimed for the Church by the Fathers a link in the chain by which indulgences can be carried back to primitive times.[5] To refute this it suffices to point out that this intercession was directed to procure pardon from God, not to remit penance, and that to claim it as a source of indulgences is to admit the vulgar belief, which the Church denies, that indulgences remit the *culpa* as well as the *pœna*.

[1] Siricii PP. Epist. I. Cap. 5, 6.

[2] Astesani Summæ Lib. V. Tit. xviii.

[3] Gloss. super Cap. 64, Dist. 50.—Astesani Summæ Lib. V. Tit. xxxv. Q. 2. See also the penance for fornicating priests (Vol. II. p. 176).

[4] Palmieri Tract. de Pœnitent. pp. 459, 465. Palmieri probably overlooked the fact that Benedict XIV. incidentally condemned this theory when he described the ancient works of penance as performed prior to absolution—Bened. PP. XIV. Const. *Inter præteritas* § 75, 3 Dec. 1749.

[5] Instruzione per un' Anima fedele sopre le Indulgenze, pp. 23–5 (Finale, 1787).

Muratori tacitly concedes the late introduction of indulgences when he ascribes their origin to the system of redemption for penance which became current under the Penitentials.[1] This undoubtedly had an influence in determining their development, but it was not the source from which they sprang. Redemptions were the precursors of indulgences, and the origin of both is to be ascribed to the power attributed at first to bishops, and subsequently to priests, to commute, to mitigate, or to prolong the infliction of penance, according to the circumstances of the case and the deserts of the penitent.[2]

To understand this properly it is necessary to trace the changes which have so completely modified the theory of indulgences, and have rendered those of modern times so essentially different from their predecessors. In its original conception an indulgence was merely the substitution of some presumably pious work for a part or the whole of the penance prescribed by the priest after confession had been made. As we have repeatedly seen above, sinners who appealed to Rome for mitigation of penance were assured that the devotion manifested and the fatigues endured in the pilgrimage entitled them to a diminution of the inflictions provided in the canons. It was a natural development from this that shrines desirous of attracting pilgrims and their oblations should seek to obtain privileges establishing a fixed term of diminution of penance as an equivalent for a visit to them accompanied by a donation. It was a simple commutation of pious works, and the earliest indulgences are all of this kind.[3] We shall see hereafter how these were slowly introduced during the eleventh century, and were cautiously limited to exceedingly brief releases of penance that had been imposed; but when Urban II. at the council of Clermont, in 1095, desired to

---

[1] Muratori Antiq. Ital. Diss. LXVIII. (T. XIV. p. 22).

[2] See Vol. I. p. 26; Vol. II. pp. 146, 170.

[3] This is a self-evident fact, and has been generally admitted. It does not suit the theories of modern apologists, however, and Palmieri's argument to disprove it (De Pœnitentia, p. 458) is a typical illustration of the art of begging the question. Yet as late as the sixteenth century Caietano argues that an indulgence is nothing more than the remission of enjoined penance (Opusc. Tract. XV. Cap. 2). Similarly Latomus, in confuting Luther (Adversus Articulos Martini Lutheri, Art. VII.), treats them as arising originally from commutations of canonical penance.

inflame to the utmost the zeal developed for the first crusade, he decreed that service in Palestine should stand in lieu of all penance incurred by those who had duly confessed their sins—an example of what came to be known as a plenary indulgence, in contradistinction to the partial indulgences then slowly coming into vogue.[1] How novel was this device is proved by the explanation offered by a contemporary, who says that in France there were many penitents unable to perform penance for their innumerable sins, as they could not live unarmed among their neighbors; they therefore consulted with Urban II., and promised to undertake the pilgrimage if he would declare it to be in full for all penance enjoined. He agreed; the idea was favorably received throughout Europe, and innumerable multitudes were speedily on their way, bearing a cross on the shoulder in sign of penitence, and shouting *Deus lo volt!*[2] Thus

[1] C. Claromont. ann. 1095, Cap. 2 (Harduin. VI. II. 1718).—"Quicunque pro sola devotione, non pro honoris vel pecuniæ adeptione, ad liberandam ecclesiam Dei Jerusalem profectus fuerit, iter illud pro omni pœnitentia ei reputetur."

Urban, in his address to the multitude, explained this as an assurance that those who die in penitence during the expedition can be sure of heaven—"Nos autem, de misericordia Dei et beatorum Petri et Pauli apostolorum confisi, fidelibus Christianis qui contra eos arma susceperint, et onus sibi hujus peregrinationis assumpserint, immensas pro suis delictis pœnitentias relaxamus. Qui autem ibi in vera pœnitentia decesserint et peccatorum indulgentiam et fructum æternæ mercedis se non dubitent habituri" (Ibid. p. 1724). In his instructions to the bishops to preach the crusade he goes somewhat further and tells them to promise that those who confess their sins shall secure speedy pardon from Christ—"Confessi peccatorum suorum ignorantiam, securi de Christo celerem impetrent veniam" (Ibid. p. 1727). In his letter to the Bolognese he says that, in view of the crusaders exposing life and property for love of God and their neighbors, all penance is remitted for sins truly and fully confessed (Urbani PP. II. Epist. CCX. *ap.* Migne, CLI. 483).

In the same sense his successor, Paschal II., forbids the Spaniards to go to the Holy Land, but to work out their penance by fighting the Saracens at home, whereby they will obtain remission and grace.—Hist. Compostellana, Lib. I. Cap. 9, 39.

[2] Chron. Cassinens. Lib. IV. Cap. xi. As the crusaders under Robert of Flanders and Robert of Normandy passed through Monte Cassino on their way to Bari, the worthy chronicler, Petrus Diaconus, doubtless obtained this story at first hands.

For those present the process was facilitated by Cardinal Gregory prostrating himself and uttering a general confession in the name of the assembled multitude, while the individuals beat their breasts and prayed for pardon of their

already were established the two specific kinds of indulgences, the plenary and the partial; the former being equivalent to the whole amount of penance imposed on the penitent, while the latter released him only for the time designated in the grant. An example of such partial relaxations by episcopal authority illustrates, like the action at Clermont, how indulgences arose out of the discretionary control of penance. When, about 1124, Diego Gelmirez of Compostella was paying Calixtus II. for the elevation of his see to an archiepiscopate, it was difficult to make remittances safely, and, as he had to send 260 silver marks, he transmitted it by pilgrims bound for Jerusalem, on whom he imposed the duty as a penance, and granted them relaxation of a year of the penance due for their sins for every ounce of gold which they would carry in safety.[1] Now this commutation of penance was practically an indulgence, though indulgences as such were not as yet known at Compostella.

Similarly the discretion which became vested in the priest to diminish or commute the canonical penance virtually amounted to an indulgence granted in the individual case. He could impose a penance and then commute it, or, in imposing a penance less than the canons prescribed, he could declare that he dispensed with the remainder—a power the abuse of which called forth the animadversion of the council of Vienne, in 1312, without checking it.[2] In the earlier period there was some doubt as to this, for Albertus Magnus denies that the parish priest has jurisdiction or superabundance of merits enabling him to grant indulgences;[3] but subsequently the priestly control over penance was recognized as enabling the confessor to bestow indulgences on those who came before him in the

---

sins, after which they received absolution and benediction and departed.—Roberti Monachi Hist. Hierosol. Lib. I. Cap. 2.

[1] Historiæ Compostellanæ Lib. II. Cap. xvi.

[2] S. Raymundi Summæ Lib. III. Tit. xxxiv. § 5, cum Postilla.—Hostiens. Aureæ Summæ Lib. v. De Remiss. §§ 5, 8.—Astesani Summæ Lib. v. Tit. xxxi. Q. 2.—Summa Angelica s. vv. *Pœnitentia* § 13; *Interrogationes*.—Summa Rosella s. v. *Indulgentia* § 28.—B. de Chaimis Interrogatorium, fol. 105.—Cap. 1, Clement. Lib. v. Tit. vii.

The Glossators on the Decretum (Jo. Teutonicus and Bart. Brixiens. about 1250) describe this priestly power "Habita ergo cordis contritione potest sacerdos partem vel totum pœnitentiæ remittere secundum qualitatem personæ, loci et temporis."—Gloss. super Cap. *Si is* Caus. XXIII. Q. 4.

[3] Alberti Magni in IV. Sentt. Dist. XX. Art. 22.

tribunal of conscience,[1] and venial priests were in the habit of selling these remissions at so much per diem of the penance remitted.[2] However demoralizing these special priestly indulgences may have been, their only interest to us lies in the evidence which they afford of the origin of the system, and they may be dismissed without entering into further details.[3]

[1] "Item sacerdotes omnes in foro pœnitentiæ possunt dare indulgentias illis quos possunt absolvere . . . Sed de quanto non determinatur nisi quod Alvarus dicit quod potest dare indulgentiam annorum vel dierum sicut ei videbitur." But a priest could not grant a general indulgence or remit a penance imposed by a superior. Priests were advised after imposing penance to grant whatever indulgence they could.—Summa Angelica s. vv. *Indulgentia* § 5; *Interrogationes.* Cf. Auream Armillam s. v. *Indulgentia* § 2.

Formulas for absolutions and indulgences of this kind, of the thirteenth or fourteenth century, will be found in Migne's Patrol. Latina, T. CXXXII. 483.

It was a mortal sin for a priest to grant indulgences when he had no power, and when he was himself making confession this was always to be inquired into.—B. de Chaimis Interrogat. fol. 93*a*.

Weigel explains (Clavic. Indulgent. Cap. 1) that by this indulgence the priest protects the penitent from remissness in performing penance.

Even in the seventeenth century it was a disputed point whether priests could grant indulgences (Juenin de Sacramentis Diss. XIII. Q. iii. cap. 1). If it had remained simply an exercise of the power of the keys there could be no question as to their ability, but it had become, as we shall see presently, a distribution of the treasure of the Church, which altered the whole theory.—Bianchi, Foriero dell' Anno Santo p. 199 (Roma, 1699). Cf. S. Th. Aquin. in IV. Sentt. Dist. XX. Q. iii. ad 1. When this was thoroughly worked out it was shown that priests could not grant real indulgences, for these were absolute releases from purgatory, while if the priest diminished the penance it had to be made up in purgatory.—Summa Sylvestrina s. v. *Indulgentia* § 12; Paulianus de Jobilæo et Indulgentiis, p. 133 (Romæ, 1550); Mich. Medinæ Disputationes de Indulgentiis Cap. XXVIII. (Venet. 1574).

[2] Steph. ex. Nottis Opus Remissionis a pœna et culpa, fol. 146*b*, 150*b*, 154, 157*a* (Mediolan. 1500). From another passage it would appear that seven pence was the customary charge for remitting a seven years' penance.

This work was officially prepared for the jubilee of 1500. Its author was a learned doctor of decretals, and the book was revised by and dedicated to Giovanni di S. Giorgio, Cardinal of SS. Nereo e Achille, whom Ciacconius (III. 168) characterizes as *sui ævi jurisconsultorum princeps*. It may therefore be regarded as authoritative. It was reprinted in 1573 in preparation for the jubilee of 1575.

[3] It is probably by some rudimentary form of this traffic that we may explain Peter Cantor's including confessors among the officials employed by bishops to extort money from their flocks.—Verb. abbreviat. Cap. XXIV.

General indulgences, which might be obtained by any one fulfilling their conditions, such as visiting a certain church, or contributing to some pious work, were beyond the competence of the priest, even within his parish, and were reserved for the episcopal order, culminating in the pope.[1] It is true that in the earlier period abbots claimed and exercised the prerogative. Equality in such matters was recognized, in 1065, by Alexander II., when, in sending back to Bishop Amalgerius a priest guilty of presbytericide and designating for him a penance of fourteen years with degradation and reclusion in a monastery, he added that after three years of due observance the rest of the penance might be remitted by the bishop or the abbot.[2] Subsequently the abbatial privilege seems to have been generally accepted and exercised, for when the blessed Stephen, abbot of Aubesaigne, in 1156, undertook to enlarge his monastery, his bishop, Gerald of Limoges, urged him to follow the custom of issuing letters of indulgence for contributions, to which the holy man replied that no one could do this but God.[3] Just before the Lateran council of 1215 the Bishop of Perugia complained to Innocent III. that the abbots of his diocese were exceeding their powers in many ways, including the issuing of indulgences, to which the pope replied prohibiting it, notwithstanding any custom to the contrary, unless they could show papal commissions empowering them.[4] This was followed, in 1216, by the action of the Lateran council, which, under the impulse of Innocent, adopted measures to concentrate in papal hands as far as possible the business of issuing indulgences. He had been lavishing plenaries for forty days' service in the crusades against the Albigenses; their utility to the Holy See had been demonstrated, and it was the part of wisdom to prevent competition, which might destroy their value, if every bishop and every abbot in Christendom was authorized to issue them for the benefit of his cathedral or his monastery. The council therefore complained of abuses springing up through their unrestricted issue, whereby indiscreet and superfluous indulgences were enervating the satisfaction of penance and bringing the keys into contempt; while the pope, who had pleni-

---

[1] Hostiens. *loc. cit.* [2] Alex. PP. II. Epist. CXV. (Migne, CXLVI. 1404).

[3] Vit. B. Steph. Obazinens. Lib. II. cap. 18 (Baluz. et Mansi I. 163).

[4] Compilat. IV. Lib. II. Tit. x. cap. 2 (Friedberg, Quinque Compilationes Antiquæ, p. 141).

tude of power, was accustomed to observe moderation. For these reasons it was decreed that abbots should no longer be allowed to grant indulgences, while bishops in future should be restricted to the maximum of forty days, except at the dedication of churches, when a year might be granted to those present, and no matter how many bishops might be in attendance, they should not be allowed to cumulate their powers.[1] This subject of episcopal indulgences is one which will require further consideration hereafter. As regards abbots, the Lateran canon does not seem to have been strictly enforced at first, for when, about 1220, the abbot of S. Pierre de Préaux, in the diocese of Lisieux, applied to Honorius III. to know whether he could issue letters of remission, the papal answer was that he could issue them through his province, provided he observed the limitations of the council.[2] Yet in time the prohibition prevailed, and it was universally recognized that abbots had no power to concede general indulgences.[3]

Thus far the theory of the indulgence was the simple one of commuting, in the exercise of sacerdotal discretion, canonical penance for the performance of some pious work—usually "almsgiving" or crusading—and while the Lateran council restricted the exercise of this discretion in promulgating general offers, of which all sinners might avail themselves, it did not interfere with the power of bishop or priest to treat individual penitents as they might see fit. An entirely new conception of indulgences, however, which eventually modified greatly both theory and practice, was developed when, towards the middle of the thirteenth century, the discovery was made that, in the Passion of Christ and in the superabundant merits of the members of Christ, the Church possessed an inexhaustible treasure which it could apply at will to satisfy for sinners by offering to God a *quid pro quo*. The importance of this conception, which has been fruitful in many ways, as we have occasionally seen above, deserves some investigation into its origin and evolution.

Reference has already been made to the early belief that the merits of the martyrs gave them a special intercessory power with God. On

[1] C. Lateranens. IV. cap. 60, 62.—Cap. 12 Extra Lib. v. Tit. xxxi.

[2] Cironii Quinta Compilatio Decret. Honor. PP. III. Tit. xx.

[3] Alex. de Ales Summæ P. IV. Q. xxiii. Membr. 3.—S. Th. Aquin. Summæ Suppl. Q. xxvi. Art. 1.—Astesani Summæ Lib. v. Tit. xl. Art. 2, Q. 2.

this same belief was based the value attached to the suffrages of the saints, the supplication for which forms so prominent a feature of the ancient liturgies,[1] though the most archaic formula (Vol. I. p. 106) of praying God to induce the saint to intercede shows how crude as yet was the conception and how tentatively it was reached. St. Eloi of Noyon includes the merits and the intercession of saints as one of the means whereby sins are pardoned, and St. Prudentius represents them as incessantly weeping and calling on God for the remission of the sins of men.[2] A prayer in a deprecatory formula of reconciliation of the eleventh century is based wholly on the intercession of the saints.[3] Yet while all this is commonly adduced in evidence of the antiquity of the doctrine of the treasure it has, in reality, nothing in common with the latter, as it is based on the individual action attributed to the martyrs and saints. They might intercede, but whether they had merits or not to contribute to a common fund was by no means universally admitted, for St. Salvianus and St. Leo I. both tell us that they are debtors to Christ and not creditors.[4] The conception of the treasure common to all and dispensed on earth through the Church is in fact founded on the interpolated article in the creed on the communion of saints, which, as we have already seen (Vol. II. p. 224) aided in establishing the custom of vicarious satisfaction. This was unknown to the early Church. There is no trace of it in the creed contained in the canons of Hippolytus and in the Egyptian Ordo, which succeeded them, nor in the Nicene creed.[5] It is lacking in the Apostles' Symbol, as set

---

[1] Sacrament. Leonian. (Muratori Opp. T. XIII. P. I. pp. 483, 485, 491, 507, 510, 565, 644, etc.).—Sacrament. Gelasian. (Ibid. T. XIII. P. II. pp. 232, 234, 235, 239, 241, 246, 257, 284, etc.).—Sacrament. Gregorian. (Ibid. pp. 520, 524, 528, 556, 648, 653, 665, 688, etc.).—Missale Francor. (Ibid. T. XIII. P. III. p. 474).—Missale Gallican. (Ibid. pp. 599, 600).

Cyprian seems to relegate the possible influence of the merits of the saints and martyrs to the day of judgment—"Credimus quidem posse apud judicem plurimum martyrorum merita et opera justorum, sed cum judicii dies venerit, cum post occasum sæculi hujus et mundi, ante tribunal Christi populus ejus adstiterit."—De Lapsis n. xvii.

[2] S. Eligii Noviomens. Homil. IV., VIII.—S. Prudentii Annal. ann. 835.

[3] Morini de Pœnit. Append. p. 25—"Intercedentibus omnibus sanctis tuis."

[4] S. Salviani adversus Avaritiam Lib. II. §§ 1, 2.—S. Leon. PP. I. Serm. LXIV. cap. iii.

[5] Canon. Hippol. XIX. 122 (Achelis, pp. 96-7).—Rufini H. E. Lib. I. cap. 6.

forth and explained by St. Eusebius of Vercelli, St. Epiphanius, Rufinus, St. Augustin, St. Maximus of Turin and St. Peter Chrysologus,[1] showing that nothing was known of it up to the end of the sixth century. It is not in the creed as recited in the Gregorian Sacramentary and in a Gallican Liturgy of the seventh century, but it makes its appearance in a Gallican Missal of about the same period.[2] This, however, apparently was not accepted outside of Gaul, for the council of Friuli, in 791, gives the Symbol without this clause, and so does an *Ordo Romanus* of about the same period,[3] nor does it seem to have maintained its place at home, for an *Ordo* of Noyon of about the year 900 omits it. On the other hand, an *Ordo* of Besançon, of about 1100, adopted for use at Tours, contains it, but its place was still uncertain, for as late as 1300 a Roman *Ordo* omits it.[4] Even to the present day it is absent from the creed of the Greek Church, although this does not prevent the saints from being called upon for their prayers and suffrages and intercession, very much as in the Latin Church.[5] Apparently Chrysostom was the first to suggest a community of interests through which all might profit, though he confined its benefits to the dead,[6] yet how little he could expect this to develop into the doctrine of the treasure may be guessed from the views just quoted of St. Salvianus and Leo I., which undoubtedly reflect the prevailing opinion of the age. In fact, the whole theory of the communion of saints and the transfer of merits is incompatible

---

[1] S. Eusebii Vercell. de Trinitate Confessio n. xvii.—S. Epiphanii Lib. Ancoratus *ad calcem*.—Rufini Comment. in Symb. Apostol. n. 36.—S. Augustini Serm. CCXIII., CCXIV., CCXV.—S. Maximi Taurinens. Homil. LXXXIII.—S. Petri Chrysologi Serm. LVII.

[2] Sacram. Gregor. (Muratori T. XIII. P. III. pp. 78-9).—Sacram. Gallican. (Ibid. pp. 709, 924).—Missale Gallican. (Ibid. pp. 522, 539).

One of the earliest allusions to the communion of saints occurs in a sermon attributed to St. Augustin, which may possibly be of the fifth century, as it attacks the Novatians. It does not regard this communion as a means of obtaining pardon for sins, but as a stimulus to us to imitate the saints by mortifying the flesh.—Ps. Augustin. Sermo de Symbolo, cap. xiii. (Migne, XL. 1192).

[3] C. Forojuliens. ann. 791 (Harduin. IV. 855).—Ordo Romanus Primus (Muratori, *loc. cit.* p. 975).

[4] Martene de antiq. Eccles. Ritibus Lib. I. Cap. viii. Art. 11, Ord. 6, 10, 17.

[5] Liber Symbolicus Russorum (Frankfort u. Leipzig, 1727).

[6] S. Jo. Chrysost. in Epist. I. ad Corinth. Homil. XLI. n. 5.

with the predestinarian doctrines and denial of free-will formulated by the second council of Orange.[1]

Yet it was impossible that the custom of redeeming sins by procuring the vicarious performance of penance should become habitual without an explanation being sought in a theory that merits could be transferred, and a corollary to this was that a sinner could be benefited by participating in the good works of holy men. It was a profitable doctrine, which religious houses speedily exploited by granting "fraternity" to benefactors, through which the latter obtained a share in the merits of the prayers and services of the brethren. Thus, in 1050, Argyrus, Duke of Italy for the Byzantine Empire, paid to the monastery of Farfa three thousand byzants for a confraternity with it, and at his death he sent it six thousand more, together with a gold-embroidered mantle valued at a hundred pounds of silver.[2] In 1154 a certain Count Hildebrand abandoned to the Abbey of St. Savior his claims over some disputed lands in consideration of the monks granting him participation in their good works.[3] Kings and magnates eagerly sought the benefits of such arrangements, which might extend, as in the Cluniac Order, to all the establishments subject to the mother-house, and the more venerable and popular abbeys numbered these fraternities by the thousand.[4] John of Salisbury denounces the evil thus wrought, since wicked men sin without scruple under the promise of redemption to be thus obtained,[5] but St. Antonino of Florence gives the thrifty advice

---

[1] The schoolmen reconciled predestination and indulgences by asserting that the reprobate, though he might obtain full remission by a plenary indulgence, would be sure to die in mortal sin.—Weigel Clavic. Indulgent. cap. xli.

[2] Chron. Farfense (Muratori S. R. I. II. II. 621–22).

[3] Muratori Antiq. Ital. Diss. LXVIII. (T. XIV. p. 101).

[4] Udalrici Consuetud. Cluniacens. Cap. xxxiii. For the fraternities granted by the Abbey of St. Gall from the ninth to the twelfth century see Goldast. et Senckenberg. *Rer. Alaman. Scriptores* II. 151–7. See also the *Liber Vitæ* of Hyde Abbey, edited by Walter De Gray Birch, Hampshire Record Soc., 1892, and for a more modern example the "Liber Confraternitatis B. Mariæ de Anima Teutonicorum de Urbe," Romæ, 1875.

[5] Jo. Saresberiens. Polycrat. VII. 21. Wickliffe found in these letters of fraternity a subject for his most scathing rhetoric.—Fifty Heresies and Errors of Friars, Cap. 15 (Arnold's English Works of Wyclif, III. 377). Cf. Trialogi Lib. IV. Cap. 30, 31.

Thomas of Walden, in his confutation of Wickliffe (De Sacramentalibus Cap. 94, n. 1), gives us the current formula of these letters—"Devotionem

to confessors to induce the rich and noble to seek participation in the good works of religious houses, which are peculiarly acceptable to God,[1] while monks were encouraged to grant such fraternities by the assurance that communicating good works to others does not diminish their utility to the performer.[2]

It was an easy deduction from this that the good works of all the faithful formed a common fund for the benefit of each member. An *Ordo* of the ninth century contains a clause in which the priest bestows on the penitent a share in this fund, which is to serve him in case he should not confess again.[3] In the same spirit, Ratherius of Verona says that if anyone is unable through infirmity to perform the fasts of prescription, the general fast of the whole Church will serve for him.[4] The merits of the Virgin and the prayers of the angels and saints are invoked as the means by which, in the early twelfth century, Paschal II. sends a deprecatory absolution to Lambert of Arras (Vol. I. p. 362). In 1127, Honorius II.,

synceram quam ad nostram habetis ordinem, ob Christi reverentiam et sanctæ Virginis matris ejus, diligentius attendentes etc. de omnium missarum jejuniorum ab. etc. participationem perpetuam vobis concedimus."

Weigel argues (Claviculæ Indulgentialis Cap. lxiii., lxv., lxxi.) that these letters serve as satisfaction and as preserving from bodily evils and perils, but do not release from contrition and confession. The service is one which can properly be paid for without simony, and it is disgraceful to accept participation without paying for it. At the same time those who grant it do not lose any of their own merits.

Joan Andrea considers it necessary to point out that these letters, while they grant participation in the suffrages of holy men, are in no sense indulgences and do not diminish penance.—Steph. ex Nottis Opus Remissionis fol. 149*a*.

In the seventeenth century Père Théophile Raynaud, S. J., tells us that the Carmelites allowed all who wore their scapular to share in the merits of the whole body, but the other Orders were more thrifty and only granted participation to benefactors or to those from whom they hoped for benefits. The merits, he says, are a fixed quantity, and the more the participants the less the share of each, so that prudence suggested discretion in not admitting too many. He boasts, however, that he had letters of participation from the Carthusians, the Minims, the Italian Congregation of the Feuillants, the Benedictine Congregation of Monte Cassino and the Order of Fontevraud.—Th. Raynaudi Scapulare Partheno-Carmeliticum, pp. 196–7 (Ed. Colon. 1658).

[1] S. Antonini Summæ P. III. Tit. xvii. Cap. 20, § 1.

[2] Astesani Summæ Lib. III. Art. iii. Q. 2.

[3] Pœnitent. Vallicell. II. Ordo Pœnitentiæ (Wasserschleben, p. 557).

[4] Ratherii Veronens. Synodica ad Presbyteros Cap. xv.

to raise an army to defend Benevento from Roger of Sicily, promises plenary remission of sins to those who should die and one-half to survivors, basing the grant on the divine authority and the merits of the Virgin and the saints,[1] and a frequent formula of papal indulgences in the twelfth century concedes them in confidence of the merits of Saints Peter and Paul.[2] The pseudo-Augustin formulated this conception in the general assertion that piety requires us to believe that all the alms and prayers and works of mercy of the whole Church will come to the assistance of the repentant sinner.[3] There is grandeur and consolation in this noble theory of the solidarity of mankind for good and not for evil so long as it had not assumed the shape of a fund out of which the Church could arbitrarily for money compound for the sins of an individual, and thus far it had not done so. Richard of S. Victor declares positively that while the priest can remit sins by imposing penitential satisfaction he cannot do so otherwise.[4] Indulgences as yet were evidently only a commutation of penance for sins repented and confessed. Soon afterwards Alain de Lille foreshadows the doctrine of the treasure when he describes the sacrifice of Christ as sufficing for the wiping out of the sins of all men, past, present and future, but he has no conception of its application to individuals at the pleasure of pope or bishop.[5]

The idea as to the community of merits which thus was in the air must necessarily have formed the subject of debate in the schools, gradually taking shape as the theologians elaborated their conception of the unity of the Church Militant and the Church Triumphant, the one with the papacy at its head as the vicar of the Trinity which had its seat in the other. If the merits of holy men on earth formed a fund for the benefit of the sinner, if the merits of the saints in

---

[1] Chron. Beneventan. (Baronii Annal. ann. 1127, n. 5).

[2] "De meritis beatorum Apostolorum Petri et Pauli confisi." Alex. PP. III. Epist. 1427 (Migne, CC. 1242).—Pflugk-Harttung Acta Pontiff. Roman. inedd. I. n. 201, 298; III. Append. n. 3.

In 1145, Eugenius III., in an indulgence for the chapel of St. James in the church of Pistoja, adds him to Peter and Paul.—Eugenii PP. III. Epist. 48 (Migne, CLXXX. 1063).

[3] Ps. Augustin. de vera et falsa Pœnitentia Cap. xii.

[4] R. a S. Victore de Potestate Ligandi etc. Cap. xxiv.

[5] Alani de Insulis de Arte Catholicæ Fidei Lib. III. Cap. xii. (Pez Thesaur. Anecd. I. II. 496).

heaven could be relied upon to relieve the sinner from the burden of satisfying for his sins, and if the transcendent merits of the humanity of Christ crucified were an inexhaustible treasure for the redemption of the race for which he suffered, how could all this be applied to those in need of it save through the Church and by the hands of the representative of Peter, to whom Christ had given the solemn charge "Feed my sheep"? Such, we may imagine, was the prevailing tendency of the arguments which gradually formulated themselves in the debates of the University of Paris under pressure of the necessity of finding some theory which would explain the efficacy of indulgences. They were a novelty which had sprung up unregarded by those who had invented the sacramental theory and who thus had not provided for them in it. Hugh of S. Victor, Gratian, Cardinal Pullus, Peter Lombard, Richard of S. Victor had taken no count of them in framing their systems and had left no word concerning them to guide their successors. Now they were growing far beyond the original scope of the discretion lodged with priest and bishop to mitigate canonical penance. Innocent III. and Honorius III. had lavished plenaries to exterminate the Albigenses, and Gregory XI. was doing the same to carry on his internecine strife with Frederic II. and to overwhelm the Stedingers. Here was a new factor which threatened to disturb the recently established definition of the sacrament of penance as consisting of contrition, confession and satisfaction, and over-curious men were asking whether the papal power extended so far, and whether God would respect in purgatory the remissions accorded by his vicar. The schoolmen were vainly endeavoring to find some working hypothesis which should satisfactorily account for all this and should silence the doubters. At the close of the twelfth century Peter Cantor pronounces all the arguments adduced in support of indulgences to be weak, though he grudgingly admits that they may pass.[1] Early in the thirteenth century Paul of Passau enumerates seven different opinions as to the source and operation of indulgences.[2] William of Auxerre can only explain them by the supposition that when a man gives a farthing to a church he receives an equivalent in the

[1] P. Cantor. Summa de Sacramentis (Morini de Pœnit. Lib. x. Cap. 20).

[2] Amort de Indulgentiis II. 59, 249. Cf. Dom. Soto in IV. Sentt. Dist. XXI. Q. ii. Art. 1.

prayers which the Church binds itself to bestow in return.[1] S. Ramon de Peñafort inclines to this theory; he gives various current opinions as to the mode of operation of indulgences, but both he and his Postillator, William of Rennes, seem very uncertain as to their effect.[2] William of Paris, in defending indulgences against those who ridiculed the idea that, for an egg or a farthing given to a church, a man might obtain remission of a third of his penance, and thus for three eggs or three farthings gain plenary remission, explains that such gifts are commutations of penance which it is competent for prelates to offer under their powers to augment or diminish the satisfaction prescribed by the canons. He also alludes to the share which the penitent secures in the prayers and services performed, and he indicates the gradual tendency to the conception of a treasure common to all the faithful when he adds that besides all this there are the general merits of the Church at large and those of the saints who are venerated at the shrine receiving his gift.[3] Still the old idea of pardon being obtained through intercession was not yet wholly lost, as is seen in an indulgence granted, in 1247, by Michael, Bishop of Angers, who bases it on the mercy of God and the intercession of the Virgin and St. Maurice and all the faithful.[4]

In this blind groping after some working hypothesis which should silence doubt and explain the new development, it was natural that recourse should be had to the indefinite but infinite sum of the superabundant merits of Christ and the members of his Church as furnishing a fund out of which the individual debts of sinners could be paid, and Alexander Hales has the credit of being the first to formulate this in accordance with the dialectic methods of the schools.[5] He does not present it as a new discovery of his own, but

---

[1] Guill. Autissiodor. Summæ Lib. IV. Tract. VI. Cap. 9 (Amort, II. 61–2; Juenin de Sacramentis Diss. XIII. Q. 5, Cap. 3).

[2] S. Raymundi Summæ Lib. III. Tit. XXXIV. § 5.

[3] Guillel. Parisiens. de Sacramento Ordinis Cap. xiii.

[4] Baluz. et Mansi Miscell. III. 99.—"Nos vero de omnipotentis Dei misericordia et beatæ Mariæ et beatorum Mauricii sociorumque ejus et omnium fidelium Dei intercessionibus confisi."

[5] Gröne (Der Ablass, p. 161) says that the idea of indulgences being drawn from a treasure is to be found in Paul of Passau, but it is there only used as a similitude.

Ambrogio Catarino, in defending the doctrine of the treasure against Luther, cites no authority for it earlier than Albertus Magnus—as a good Dominican

assumes its existence as an accepted fact, though in one passage he speaks in a somewhat hesitating way. Like his contemporaries, he was not embarrassed, as are the moderns, by the necessity of proving that existing customs had always existed; he had only to explain them and find some colorable reason for them. He therefore sets out with the postulate that there are three kinds of merits—those of the penitent, those of Christ, who makes over his passion to us, and those of the Church as a whole. From these there is a triple remission of punishment—the eternal penalty is changed to temporal in the remission of the *culpa;* the temporal, which is beyond our strength, to a temporal which we can endure, by the absolution of the priest; thirdly, this is reduced to a still smaller infliction by the indulgence, in which the merits of the Church satisfy for us. The command to perform works meet for repentance is obeyed equally through works of satisfaction by the sinner or by the suffrages of others which have value sufficient to pay the debt. This vicarious

---

he could not be expected to recognize the Franciscan Hales. He admits that the belief is not of ancient origin, and falls back upon the customary argument that there are many things developed by modern doctors which were unknown to the Fathers, that when such things are approved by papal decrees they must be accepted as grounded in Scripture, and that to call them in question is heresy.—Ambr. Catharini adv. M. Lutheri Dogmata Libb. III., V., fol. 74*b*, 88–9.

Giovanni da Fano, in confuting Luther, contents himself with the argument that the existence of the treasure is proved by the authority of the Church, which cannot err.—Opera utilissima vulgare contra le perniciosissime heresie Lutherane per li simplici, fol. 63*b* (Bologna, 1532).

Miguel Medina, one of the Tridentine theologians, freely admits (Disputat. de Indulgentiis Cap. xlii.) that modern indulgences based on the treasure are wholly different from the older indulgences, which were remissions of penance. The treasure, he says, was not known to the Fathers, for its use was reserved to modern times.

Since the council of Trent this frankness is no longer admissible. Ferraris (Prompta Bibl. s. v. *Indulgentia* Art. 1, n. 4) tells us that the treasure is proved by the perpetual tradition of the Church. Palmieri's argument (De Pœnitentia p. 469) is an admirable example of *petitio principii*—it is only through the treasure that the Church could grant indulgences; the Church grants indulgences; therefore the treasure exists. This, however, is not original with him; it is virtually the same as the reasoning of Dr. Gilles Charlier, who was put forward, in 1433, by the council of Bâle to convert the Hussite envoys (Orat. Egid. Carlerii in Con. Basiliens. *ap* Harduin, VIII. 1793), and of Caietano against the Lutheran heresy (Opusc. Tract. VIII. de Indulgentiis Q. 1).

satisfaction is the pivot on which the whole theory turns, and it is elaborately justified by dialectics. The Church is a mystical body, and in the human body one member exposes itself to protect another, as the arm to save the head; a human creditor who is paid does not trouble himself as to who furnishes the money; Christ's passion satisfies for us as well as for him, and we are all members of Christ. Indulgences are granted from the supererogatory merits of the members of Christ and chiefly from those of Christ himself, which are the spiritual treasure of the Church. Yet subsequently, when he comes to consider the question whether the pope can grant remission of all *pœna*, he hesitates somewhat and urges that otherwise the multitudes to whom the pope has conceded remission of all sins would be deluded, while finally he only ventures to assert that the control of the pope over the treasure is probably or most truly presumable.[1]

This is the earliest assertion of the treasure and its uses, which were destined to work changes so momentous in the theory and practice of the Church and to supplement the power of the keys by placing purgatory under the control of the Holy See. These changes will be considered presently, and meanwhile we must trace the progress and development of the doctrine itself. Albertus Magnus was disposed to regard it favorably. He says there are three opinions as to the nature of indulgences: first, they are said to be commutations; second, that they are mitigations of penance, and both of these can be sustained, but he regards as preferable the third, that they are payments from the treasure by the power of the keys.[2] Evidently the new theory was making its way and commending itself as a solvent of the perplexing questions raised by the use of indulgences. It is true that William of Rennes, the commentator on S. Ramon de Peñafort, seems to know nothing of the treasure; that Bishop William Durand makes no allusion to it, and explains the virtue of indulgences by the prayers which the Church obligates itself to offer for those who purchase them, and that even in the fourteenth century François de Mairone argues that they spring from the power of the

[1] Alex. de Ales Summæ P. IV. Q. XXIII. Membr. 1, Art. 1, 2; Membr. 5, 6.

[2] Alb. Mag. in IV. Sentt. Dist. XX. Art. 16.—"Et idcirco hanc diffinitionem meliorem aliis judico."

keys and not from the treasure.[1] With a few exceptions, such as these, however, the new theory was eagerly accepted in the schools and was assumed as a fact by the leading schoolmen, such as Cardinal Henry of Susa, Aquinas, Bonaventura, Peter of Tarantaise, Duns Scotus, Astesanus, Durand de S. Porcian, Pierre de la Palu etc., with a unanimity that renders special reference to them superfluous. Yet the Holy See for awhile hesitated to stamp it with the seal of authority, in spite of the added power which, as we shall see, it conferred on the papacy. When, in 1300, Boniface VIII. tried the bold experiment of instituting the Jubilee, in which he lavished plenary indulgences for a pilgrimage to Rome, he abstained in the bull *Antiquorum* from making any reference to the treasure as the source whence they were to be drawn.[2] It was not until a century had passed since the theory was broached by Alexander Hales that it received papal confirmation. When, in 1343, at the request of the Romans, Clement VI. proclaimed for 1350 a new Jubilee, he based his power on the treasure of the merits of Christ, the Virgin and the saints, confided for distribution to the successors of St. Peter; he presents it in an argumentative way, which shows that he was enunciating a doctrine not wholly as yet incorporated in the faith, and he asserts his belief that Boniface VIII. had acted under the same conviction.[3] After the papal sanction had thus been given, of course there could no longer be any question as to the existence of the treasure and its function in serving as a basis for indulgences.

[1] G. Redonens. Postil. super Summ. Raymundi Lib. III. Tit. XXXV. § 5.—G. Durandi Speculi Lib. IV. Partic. iv. De Pœnit. et Remiss. n. 9-12.—Fr. de Mayronis in IV. Sentt. Dist. XIX. Q. ii.

[2] Boniface's nephew, however, Cardinal Jacopo Caietano, in his defence of the novel institution of the jubilee, does not fail to base it on the inestimable treasure-house of jewels furnished by the blood of Christ and the merits of the saints.—Card. Jac. Caietani de Jubilæo cap. 14.

[3] Clement. PP. VI. Bull. *Unigenitus* 27 Jan. 1343 (Cap. 2 Extrav. Commun. Lib. v. Tit. ix.).—It is somewhat remarkable that, towards the close of the seventeenth century, the existence of the treasure should be treated as an open question. A Catholic polemic formally asserts that "The Church herein hath determined nothing," and he quotes Dr. Holden's Resolution of Faith—"Cætera etiam dubia sunt et a theologis in utramque partem agitata, Nimirum, An sit thesaurus aliquis meritorum et satisfactionum in Ecclesia cujus dispensatores sint Romanus Pontifex et reliqui Ecclesiæ Pastores."—The Roman Doctrine of Repentance and Indulgences vindicated against Dr. Stillingfleet's Misrepresentations, pp. 75–6 (London, 1672).

When, in 1786, Scipione de' Ricci, at the synod of Pistoia, declared the treasure to be the creation of the schoolmen, which had replaced the clear conception of a remission of penance with a false and confused application of merits, Pius VI., in 1794, condemned this opinion as false, rash, insulting to the merits of Christ and the saints and already condemned in the seventeenth article of Luther.[1]

Yet it illustrates the difficulty of defining the indefinable that theologians have never been able to agree as to what constitutes the treasure which is so confidently asserted and so generously distributed. As we have seen, Hales speaks of it as consisting of the merits of the members of Christ. Albertus Magnus is more definite and describes it as formed of the merits of Christ, the Virgin, and of all the apostles, martyrs and saints, dead and living. Henry of Susa confines it to Christ and the martyrs. Aquinas attributes it to the passion of Christ and the merits of the saints. Pierre de Tarantaise (Innocent V.) alludes only to the merits of Christ. Duns Scotus includes the Virgin and the saints.[2] The subject was one which was already exciting the debates of the schools. Durand de S. Porcian tells us that there were those who asserted that both Christ and the saints were sufficiently remunerated and that there was no surplus of merits; for himself, he admits the merits of Christ, but excludes those of the saints—not that they had no surplus, but there is no record of their communicating it for our benefit, and the intention of the possessor is requisite to such communication.[3] Pierre de la Palu includes both Christ and the saints, but admits that the latter were a subject of debate; as for the Virgin, she committed no actual sin and paid the debt of original sin by dying, so that all her merits accrue to us.[4] Clement VI., as we have seen, in the bull *Unigenitus*, formally defined the treasure as

---

[1] C. Pistoriens. ann. 1786, Sess. V. Decr. de Pœnit. § xvi.—Pii PP. VI. Const. *Auctorem fidei*, Prop. 39.

When Ricci had the same views put forward in detail in T. XI. of the *Raccolta di Opuscoli interessanti la Religione*, the work was promptly put on the Index by decree of June 4, 1787 (Index Leonis XIII. p. 269).

[2] Alberti Mag. in IV. Sentt. Dist. xx. Art. 16.—Hostiens. Aureæ Summæ Lib. v. De Remiss. § 7.—S. Th. Aquin. in IV. Sentt. Dist xx. Q. 3; Summæ Suppl. Q. xxv. Art. 1.—P. de Tarantas. in IV. Sentt. Dist. xx. Q. iii. Art. 1 (Amort, II. 67).—J. Scoti in IV. Sentt. Dist. xx. Q. *unic.*

[3] Durand. de S. Porciano in IV. Sentt. Dist. xx. Q. iii. §§ 6–8.

[4] P. de Palude in IV. Sentt. Dist. xx. Q. iv. ad 1.

consisting of the merits of Christ, the Virgin, and the saints, but this did not silence the schoolmen. There were some who accepted the definition,[1] while others denied it. Thus Henry of Hesse not only argues that the saints have no superabundant satisfactions, but that sinners who are able to satisfy for their sins are not to be relieved by the merits of others,[2] and Angiolo da Chivasso stoutly attributes the whole to Christ, though he admits the common opinion to be that the saints contribute.[3] Caietano treats the subject at considerable length and proves that the treasure consists of the superfluous merits of Christ and the saints, but he introduces a new element of discord when he says that sometimes they are called merits, sometimes passions and sometimes satisfactions, the proper term being superfluous satisfactions.[4] The council of Trent left these knotty questions untouched, and when Michael Bay taught that the passions of the saints, communicated in indulgences, do not redeem our sins, but render us worthy to be liberated by the price of Christ's blood, his position was condemned by three successive popes.[5] Yet the distinction is almost impalpable which distinguishes this from the dictum of Noël Alexandre, which passed unreproved, that the treasure consists solely in the blood and merits of Christ; to mingle with this those of the martyrs is a mere invention, though the latter may have efficacy in suffrage to obtain for us the application of the former.[6] This again is scarce more than a variant of the theory of Bellarmine, which is maintained by Palmieri at the present day, that the merits of the saints form part of the treasure, but only in virtue of the merits of Christ; it is the latter that give the Church power to grant indulgences, through which she distributes the former.[7] Modern theologians, however, for the most part content themselves with describing the treasure as consisting of the merits of Christ and the saints, sometimes including those of the Virgin

[1] Ps. Pilichdorff. contra Waldenses cap. 80 (Mag. Bibl. Pat. XIII. 328).—S. Antonini Summæ P. I. Tit. x. cap. 3, § 1.—Weigel Claviculæ Indulg. cap. xxxv.

[2] Weigel *op. cit.* cap. xxxvii.

[3] Summa Angelica s. v. *Indulgentia* § 9.

[4] Caietani Opusc. Tract. VIII. De Indulg. Q. 2, 3.

[5] Urbani PP. VIII. Bull. *In eminenti* Prop. 60.

[6] N. Alexandri Hist. Eccles. Sæc. XV. et XVI. Dissert. xii. Art. 15, Scholion.

[7] Bellarmin. de Indulg. Lib. II. cap. 5.—Palmieri Tract. de Pœnit. pp. 469–70.

and sometimes not, and sometimes characterizing them as satisfactions and sometimes as merits.[1] Evidently the labors of six hundred years have not succeeded in casting light into the impenetrable darkness.

Whatever doubt there may be as to the composition of the treasure there can be none as to the revolution which its discovery effected in the whole conception of the remission of sin. This is well described by Willem van Est when pointing out the error of Peter Lombard, who held that contrition, even without confession (and consequently without absolution) wiped out sin. This error van Est said was based on the conception that true contrition and remission of sin are inseparable, but this conception is false because there can be no possible remission of sin save by virtue of the passion of Christ as satisfaction for the *pœna* of the sin. Therefore repentance does not suffice for the remission of sin, but in addition there must be the application of the passion of Christ to the sinner.[2] Thus the old beliefs became obsolete, and indulgences were no longer a mere discretional substitution of some enjoined work for the canonical penance due to the sin which had been absolved in the sacrament, but were an absolute payment to God of an equivalent, the equivalent being furnished to the sinner by the Church out of its inexhaustible treasure. This was recognized already by the time of Aquinas and Bonaventura,[3] and a modern author expresses it truly by saying that the formal indulgence consists in two acts, first in gaining a portion of the treasure

---

[1] Estii in IV. Sentt. Dist. xx. § 5.—Layman Theol. Moral. Lib. v. Tract. vii. cap. 1, n. 1.—Viva de Jubilæo et Indulgentiis, pp. 69-70 (Ed. 1750)—Trullench Exposit. Bullæ S. Cruciatæ Lib. i. § 1, Dub. 14, n. 2.—Reiffenstuel Theol. Moral. Tract. xii. Dist. iii. n. 3-6.—S. Alph. de Ligorio Theol. Moral. Lib. vi. n. 531.—Gury Comp. Theol. Moral. II. 1041.—Bonal Institt. Theol. IV. 277.

The nearest approach to an official definition is that contained in the "Raccolta di Orazioni e Pie Opere" (Roma, 1886, p. x), which speaks of the "Tesoro dei meriti satisfattorii di Gesù Cristo, di Maria Santissima e dei Santi."

[2] Estii in IV. Sentt. Dist. xvii. § 1.

[3] "Ille qui indulgentias accepit non absolvitur, simpliciter loquendo, a debito pœnæ, sed datur ei unde debitum solvat."—S. Th. Aquin. in IV. Dist. xx. Q. iii. ad 2; Summæ Suppl. Q. xxv. Art. 1 ad 2. "Non absolvit omnino condonando sed pro eo solvendo de ecclesiastico thesauro."—Bonavent. in IV. Sentt. Dist. xx. P. ii. Art. 1, Q. 2.

which has been opened and, second, in presenting it in discharge of the debt.[1] This led naturally to the mercantile treatment of sin and pardon, so frequently observed above, in which the sinner is taught that God keeps an account with him, which is to be paid, it matters little how.

This was by no means the only change wrought by the introduction of the treasure. As the doctrine spread that absolution was merely the application by the power of the keys of a portion of the treasure, it would follow that the priest could apply it for the removal of the *pœna* as well as of the *culpa*, for satisfaction is an integral part of the sacrament. In the original form of indulgences, as merely commutations of penance, they were at the command of the confessor, and we have seen (p. 12) how long the priestly class strove to exploit them. To suppress this, which was viewed with growing disfavor, it was necessary to dissociate indulgences from the sacrament. Further, as the custom grew up of granting indulgences by papal legates and cardinal deacons and bishops-elect who might not be in priests' orders, it was also necessary to explain that this was not a function of orders. Yet it did not do to eliminate wholly the power of the keys from a matter connected so intimately with the remission of sin, and recourse was had to the convenient device of the key of jurisdiction. The granting of indulgences thus was declared to be a function of jurisdiction and not of orders, and to be extra-sacramental. This position was only reached step by step. Hales explains that granting indulgences requires the power of the keys, together with jurisdiction and authority to dispense the treasure, which belongs solely to bishops.[2] Albertus Magnus attributes it to the power of the keys and the treasure, but jurisdiction is indispensable.[3] Henry of Susa is still more emphatic in confining the function to those in orders: legates who are not priests cannot grant indulgences; for bishops to do so before consecration is a custom to be reproved, especially if they are not priests, for they have not the power of the keys in enjoining and relaxing penance;

[1] "Il formale dell' Indulgenze consiste in due atti; cioè in guadagnar un tanto del tesoro operto, ed in presentarlo à difalco del tuo reato."—Bianchi, Il Foriero dell' Anno Santo, p. 6 (Trevigi, 1699).

[2] Alex. de Ales Summæ P. IV. Q. XXIII. Membr. iii.

[3] Alb. Magni in IV. Sentt. Dist. xx. Artt. 16, 22.

priests alone have this.[1] Evidently it was difficult to reconcile theory with practice till Aquinas modified the theory by boldly pronouncing indulgences not to be sacramental; they were purely matters of jurisdiction, and, though an exercise of the power of the keys, it was of the key of jurisdiction, not of orders.[2] This does not seem to have met with immediate and unquestioning acceptance, for John of Freiburg says somewhat doubtfully that granting indulgences is a matter rather of jurisdiction than of orders.[3] Astesanus copies Aquinas, but Durand de S. Porcian asserts absolutely that no one not in priest's orders can grant indulgences; if cardinal deacons and bishops-elect do so, they only promulgate what have been granted by the pope.[4] The opinion of Aquinas, however, solved too many difficulties not to prevail, and St. Antonino says positively that to grant indulgences it is not necessary to be a priest, for it is merely a matter of jurisdiction; even a layman can apply the indulgence at death if a priest is not at hand.[5] Caietano finds some difficulty in evading the principle that the benefits of the Church can only be dispensed through the sacraments; to confer the effect of a sacrament without a sacrament belongs to the *claves excellentiæ*, which Christ reserved to himself and did not bestow on St. Peter; but he pleads custom and proceeds to prove that this special treasure can be distributed without a sacrament, though the power of the keys are the source of the grant, and the power to bind and to loose must be exercised through the sacraments.[6] Prierias has less trouble in following his master, Aquinas, and asserts decidedly that indulgences are a matter of jurisdiction and not of orders.[7] Willem van Est goes still further and argues that, like excommunication, they pertain to the jurisdiction of the external forum.[8] On the other hand, Palmieri, while asserting that they belong to jurisdiction and not to

---

[1] Hostiens. Aureæ Summæ Lib. v. De Remiss. § 6.—Summa Rosella s. v. *Indulgentia* § 3.

[2] S. Th. Aquin. in IV. Sentt. Dist. xx. Q. iii. ad 1; Q. iv. ad 2; Summæ Suppl. Q. xxvi. Artt. ii., iv.

[3] J. Friburg. Summæ Confess. Lib. iii. Tit. xxxiv. Q. 184.

[4] Astesani Summæ Lib. v. Tit. xl. Art. 2, Q. 4, 6.—Durand de S. Porciano in IV. Sentt. Dist. xx. Q. 5.

[5] S. Antonini Summæ P. I. Tit. x. Cap. 3, §§ 1, 5.

[6] Caietani Opusc. Tract. viii. Q. iv.; Tract. xvi. De Indulg. Q. vi.

[7] Summa Sylvestrina s. v. *Indulgentia* §§ 7, 13.

[8] Estii in IV. Sentt. Dist. xx. § 6.

orders, admits that they are derived from the power to bind and to loose, and that this power is exercised in the internal forum.[1] It is conceded that the pope can commission simple clerks or even laymen to grant indulgences,[2] but one of the accusations of the council of Constance against John XXIII. was that he had sent as nuncio to Brabant a married layman, who had collected much money by the sale of indulgences.[3] Evidently the theologians have found no little difficulty in fitting the distribution of the treasure through indulgences into the pre-existing sacramental system which had been somewhat clumsily grafted upon the ancient simplicity.

This is not the only question which has perplexed the doctors. We have just seen that the use of the treasure is a *solutio* or payment which enabled the sinner to cancel his debt to God, and that the whole process is extra-sacramental. Yet in spite of Aquinas and Bonaventura it was not easy to eliminate the idea that a matter so closely connected with the sacrament was not an absolution. Domingo Soto thus asserts that indulgences are a true absolution and not a payment, although a payment intervenes.[4] A lively debate on the subject was carried on for a considerable time. Willem van Est sought to settle it by proving that they are a true absolution, but only in the external forum, which confines them to the episcopal jurisdiction.[5] Bellarmine offered a more satisfactory compromise when he suggested that they are both a payment and an absolution, a suggestion which has been very generally adopted.[6] Busenbaum, however, followed by Liguori, defines that indulgences are given as absolutions (*per modum absolutionis*),[7] while the most recent authority

---

[1] Palmieri Tract. de Indulg. pp. 447, 472–3.

[2] Juenin de Sacramentis Diss. XIII. Q. iii. Cap. 2.—Viva de Jubilæo ac Indulgent. p. 84 (Ed. 1750).

[3] C. Constant. Sess. XI. Art. xxi. xxii. (Von der Hardt, VII[I]. 348–9).

Yet Aquinas had already in the thirteenth century proved that a non-priest could grant indulgences if he was duly commissioned (Quodl. II. Art. xvi. ad 2) —"Potest enim et non sacerdos indulgentiam concedere si sit ei commissum."

[4] Dom. Soto in IV. Sentt. Dist. XXI. Q. 1, Art. 2.

[5] Estii in IV. Sentt. Dist. XX. § 6.

[6] Bellarmin. de Indulgent. Lib. II. Cap. 5.—Lavorii de Jubilæo et Indulgentiis P. II. Cap. viii. n. 4.—Polacchi Comment. in Bull. Urbani VIII. p. 334.—Juenin de Sacram. Diss. XIII. Q. ii. Cap. 1.—Viva de Jubilæo, p. 78.—Van Ranst Opusc. de Indulgent. p. 45.—Palmieri Tract. de Pœnit. p. 448.

[7] S. Alph. de Ligorio Theol. Moral, VI. 531.

on the subject, Father Beringer, S. J., gives the definition of a juridical absolution, based on the power of the keys and supreme jurisdiction.[1] How far indulgences have superseded the sacrament is seen in a decision of the Congregation of Indulgences, in 1841, that when confession is prescribed as a *sine qua non*, absolution is unnecessary.[2]

There was one point on which the theory of the treasury offered a welcome solution of a difficult question. So long as indulgences were merely commutations or mitigations of imposed penance sinners might be tormented with doubts as to the sufficiency of the rapidly diminishing satisfaction required of them in the confessional. The idea that the indulgence is a payment, and a plenary indulgence a payment in full, was easily developed into the conclusion that it supplied all defects of the confessor in enjoining penance; as regards partial indulgences there were many doubtful questions, as we shall see hereafter, but a penitent who obtained a plenary discharged all his debts and there was no longer ground for anxiety in the fact, admitted by all theologians, that God alone knows the measure of satisfaction required to remit the penalty of a given sin or series of sins. This was an immense comfort to all parties, especially when plenaries became multiplied and were attainable by all with the slenderest exertion. An effort to accomplish this, prior to the general acceptance of the doctrine of the treasure, is found in a curious formula of indulgence, granted, in 1247, by Michael Bishop of Angers for the benefit of the church of S. Julien of Tours, granting forty days, not in the usual form of remission of penance enjoined (*de injunctis pœnitentiis*) but of what ought to be enjoined (*de pœnitentia injungenda*) for the sins of the recipient.[3] Soon after this Albertus Magnus, in accepting the doctrine of the treasure, points out the

---

[1] Beringer, Die Ablässe, p. 39 (Ed. 1893, Paderborn).

As Father Beringer is a consultor of the Sacred Congregation of Indulgences, and as his work has the approbation of that body, it may be regarded as authoritative.

[2] Decr. Authent. n. 544. This would appear to assume that indulgences have power over the *culpa*—a question which will be considered hereafter. Bishop Bouvier endeavors to explain it as applying to those who lead so saintly a life that there is no material for the sacrament (Traité des Indulgences, p. 69), but there is nothing in the decree to justify this.

[3] Baluz. et Mansi Miscell. III. 99.

advantage of indulgences as diminishing penance, both that which is enjoined and that which ought to be enjoined if the confessor has erred in prescribing too little, thus curing all defects.[1] Aquinas formulated this in the most positive manner; indulgences do not, as asserted by some, release only from the penance imposed by the priest, but from all, whether enjoined or not, for otherwise the Church would harm rather than help, releasing from penance and leaving the soul exposed to the heavier pains of purgatory.[2] Under this authority the principle was accepted by succeeding theologians, that the indulgence, whether plenary or partial, so far as it went, released from the *pœna* and remedied any mistake of the confessor, while a still further development extended its power to forgotten sins and supplemented defects in confession.[3] Yet this acceptance was not universal. There were still those who held that it depended on the formula employed in the grant of indulgence, and that when this was in the customary phrase of "de injunctis pœnitentiis" its effect was limited by the amount of penance actually imposed; moreover, when the indulgence ran, as it frequently did, "of sins of which confession has been made," forgotten sins were not included, and neither were venials.[4] Gabriel Biel tells us that the question is one on which most of the doctors feel great doubts, and Adrian VI. says positively that only enjoined penance is covered by an ordinary plenary, though he accepts the explanation of Pierre de la Palu that when it is *plenissima* it includes all penance that ought to have been enjoined.[5] The rigid Caietano, in 1517, protested against the prevailing laxity and argued strenuously that all indulgences, even the *plena* and *plenissima*, only released from enjoined penance, but, in 1518, when at Augsburg, engaged in controversy with Luther, he felt obliged to admit that the common consent of the doctors rendered dissent from the prevailing opinion rash, and that if indul-

[1] Alb. Mag. in IV. Sentt. Dist. xx. Art. 18.

[2] S. Th. Aquin. Summa Suppl. Q. xxv. Art. 1.

[3] Astesani Summæ Lib. v. Tit. xl. Art. 1.—P. de Palude in IV. Sentt. Dist. xx. Q. iv. ad 2 Concl. 2.—S. Antonini Summæ P. i. Tit. x. cap. 3 § 3.—Weigel Claviculæ Indulgent. cap. vi. xiii. xxiv.—Steph. ex Nottis Opus Remissionis fol. 9*a*.

[4] Summa Rosella s. v. *Indulgentia* §§ 16, 18.—Summa Sylvestrina s. v. *Indulgentia* §§ 5, 22, 32.

[5] Gabr. Biel in IV. Sentt. Dist. xlv. Q. iii. Art. 1.—Adriani PP. VI. Disput. in IV. Sentt. fol. clxii, clxiii. (Romæ, 1522).

gences were not a remission of all penalties the faithful would be deceived.[1] Jacob Latomus denounces as a cardinal error of Luther's the assertion that indulgences only release from canonical penance;[2] yet not long afterwards Bartolommeo Fumo takes a more rigid view and asserts that they release only from enjoined penance, and only those moreover who are prepared to perform it, which is a serious limitation on their functions.[3] The council of Trent was discreetly silent on the subject; but one of its theologians, Miguel Medina, devotes a long argument to controvert the error of the Lutherans and of Caietano and to prove that indulgences have always covered all the penance due for sins,[4] while Domingo Soto and Rodriguez return to the definition that it depends on the formula employed in the grant, Pedro Soto declares that the question is in doubt, many doctors being ranged on either side, and Cardinal Toletus follows Aquinas and St. Antonino that all penalty due is remitted.[5] This latter opinion became the prevailing one, among rigorists as well as laxists, and it was argued with much force, in view of the minimized penance in fashion, that otherwise indulgences would be of no use and that sinners would not take the trouble to procure them.[6] Yet Muzzarelli, in combating the errors of the Tuscan movement, admits that if the indulgence is *de injunctis pœnitentiis* it only releases from the enjoined penance,[7] but when the synod of Pistoia defined indulgences to be merely remissions of part of the penance prescribed by the

---

[1] Caietani Opusc. Tract. XV. De Indulg. cap. 2, 7; Tract. XVI. Q. iv.

[2] Jac. Latomi contra Articulos Martini Lutheri Art. VII.

[3] Aurea Armilla s. v. *Indulgentia* n. 13.

[4] Mich. Medinæ Disputat. de Indulgent. cap. XIII. XIV. (Venetiis, 1564).

[5] Dom. Soto in IV. Sentt. Dist. XXI. Q. ii. Art. 1.—Rodriguez, Bulla della Crociata, p. 83.—P. Soto Instruct. Sacerd. Lect. II. De Indulg. (Amort, II. 146).—Toleti Instruct. Sacerd. Lib. VI. cap. xxiii. § 2.

Dr. Amort asserts (De Indulg. II. 249) that prior to 1570 all indulgences were merely relaxations of enjoined penance.

[6] Estii in IV. Sentt. Dist. XX. §§ 1, 3.—Layman Theol. Moral. Lib. v. Tract. vii. cap. 3, n. 1, 2.—Busenbaum Medullæ Theol. Moral. Lib. VI. Tract. ii. Art. 2, § 2, n. 1.—Quarti Trattato del Giubileo, p. 36.—Juenin de Sacram. Diss. XIII. Q. ii. cap. 3; Q. v. cap. 1.—Pignatelli, Il Giubileo dell' Anno Santo, p. 10.—Viva de Jubilæo ac Indulgentiis, p. 73.—La Croix Theol. Moral. Lib. VI. P. ii. n. 1237.—Ferraris Prompta Bibl. s. v. *Pœnit. Sacram.* Art. III. n. 3.—Andreucci de Requisitis ad lucrandas Indulg. pp. xix. xxi.—Giunchi de Indulgentiis, pp. 15–18.

[7] Jouhanneaud, Dict. des Indulgences, p. 134.

canons, Pius VI. condemned the proposition as false, rash, insulting to the merits of Christ and long ago condemned in the nineteenth article of Luther.[1] Since then I presume there has been no dissidence on the subject, especially as, in recent times, the old formula of "de injunctis pœnitentiis" has been disused.[2] Gröne argues that no one can feel safe without indulgences, for who can say what punishment God imposes for sin, while with the indulgence we have the guarantee of Christ and the Church that whatever is lacking is made up in grace, and all mistakes are rectified. It is true, he admits, that many well-meaning Catholics raise the objection that indulgences remit for penance which has not been imposed, but this, he assures them, arises from a misunderstanding of the matter.[3] Palmieri asserts that indulgences are not a mere remission of the penances constituted by the Church, for the old canons have long since lost their binding force and have been replaced by indulgences; he admits that there are some troublesome questions connected with the formula "de pœnitentiis injunctis," and suggests that, now that the canons are obsolete it may mean "de injungendis."[4] Beringer argues that if indulgences were only a release from canonical penance, they would not be worth the discussion which they have caused, and souls would only have the choice between suffering in purgatory or undergoing more strenuous penance on earth.[5] From all this will be seen how completely the theory and practice of the matter have been revolutionized by the treasure.

Before the idea was universally accepted that indulgences cover more than penance actually enjoined, devices were in vogue to secure all possible benefit from them in a manner which shows how completely material were the conceptions of the relations between man

---

[1] Sinodo di Pistoja, Sess. v. n. xvi.—Pii PP. VI. Bull. *Auctorem fidei* Prop. 40. This is a somewhat strained construction to place on Prop. 19 of the bull *Exsurge Domine*, in which the Lutheran error condemned is the general assertion that indulgences are not of service in cases of actual sin.

[2] Bouvier, Traité des Indulgences, p. 32 (Ed. 1855). In 1577 the expression is no longer to be found in the indulgences with which Sixtus V. enriched the imperial gold medals found in the Vatican (Bullar. II. 664). In 1592 a partial indulgence of Clement VIII. has the formula "de injunctis sibi vel alias debitis pœnitentiis" (Amort, I. 213), evidently framed to prevent discussion.

[3] Gröne, Der Ablass, pp. 48, 130, 143.

[4] Palmieri Tract. de Pœnit. pp. 446, 477, 485.

[5] Beringer, Die Ablässe, p. 13.

and God, and how the latter could be circumvented at the least possible expense of repentance and amendment. Thus Pierre de la Palu recommends that when an indulgence is "de pœnitentiis injunctis," a man who is about to gain it should confess all his sins and get the priest to impose on him the severest penance on bread and water for as many days as the indulgence remits, for thus, when he gets it, it will be worth as much as the performance of this rigorous penance; moreover, he points out that indulgences are much safer than penance, for it is easier for him to remain in grace during the hour or so required by the indulgence than during the prolonged term of the penance.[1] Caietano and his disciple Fumo righteously reject such artifices and pronounce them useless, for the resort to them shows that the sinner is not really penitent and not ready to undergo the penance due to his sins, which they hold to be a condition precedent to enjoying the benefit of the indulgence.[2] Yet notwithstanding this, Azpilcueta repeats the suggestion, adding the alternative that a man can confess all his sins, get his confessor to impose full penance for them, and then look for an indulgence to cover the whole, all of which is duly re-echoed in the seventeenth century by Valère Renaud.[3] In the same spirit, when the extension of indulgences to cover all penance that ought to have been enjoined had become generally recognized, confessors were advised that when a penitent refused to accept a certain penance, they could impose a trifle and order him to gain a plenary indulgence, or when a penitent had accumulated a mass of unperformed penance from previous confessions it could be commuted into something easy conjoined with an indulgence.[4] Evidently in many ways indulgences smooth the path of the sinner and enable him to come to terms not only with an accommodating confessor but with God.

Another important modification wrought by the theory of the treasure in the doctrine of indulgences was its influence on epis-

---

[1] P. de Palude in IV. Sentt. Dist. XX. Q. iv. ad 2 Concl. 3.

[2] Caietani Opusc. Tract. x. De Indulg. Q. 1.—Aurea Armilla s. v. *Indulgentia* § 13.

[3] Azpilcuetæ Comment. de Jobilæo, Notab. IX. § 12.—Reginaldi Praxis Fori Pœnit. Lib. VII. n. 151.

[4] Ludov. Leti Tract. de Indulgentiis Sect. 2.—This work, I believe, has never been printed. My copy is in MS. with the date of 1643. The author was a priest of the Society of Jesus.

copal authority and on the concentration of the function of granting indulgences in the hands of the Holy See. We have seen that at first the power to confer them was lodged equally with bishops and pope and was even enjoyed similarly by abbots, while priests had it also in so far as their individual penitents were concerned. If the power of bishops became limited at the Lateran council of 1216, it was with their own consent and was a mere matter of discipline liable to be modified or abrogated in the same manner. All this was changed with the introduction of the treasure and the discovery that conferring indulgences was a matter of jurisdiction and not of orders. Urban II. at the council of Clermont, in 1096, recognized no exclusive power of his own when he reported that the plenary indulgence then granted was by his authority and by that of nearly all the archbishops and bishops of France, thus placing all on the same level.[1] In the ancient formulas of indulgences the popes usually defined their authority as derived from St. Peter or from St. Peter and St. Paul;[2] the bishops, on the contrary, make no reference to the apostles, showing that they held their power directly and not mediately through the Holy See, and this formula being established was maintained long after they had been reduced to the position of subordinates.[3] Alexander Hales sees clearly enough that his doctrine

[1] "Tam nostra quam omnium pene archiepiscoporum et episcoporum qui in Galliis sunt auctoritate dimittimus."—Urbani PP. II. Epist. CCX.

In what is probably the earliest indulgence issued in Spain, in 1118, after the capture of Saragossa from the Moors, to raise funds for the support of the new see, the bishop, Pedro, grants it on the authority of Gelasius II. and of all the Spanish bishops, several of whom subscribe and confirm it (Blanca, Aragonensium Rerum Commentarii, Cæsaraugustæ, 1588, pp. 139-40). The whole document manifests a very rudimentary conception of the business.

[2] "De gratia Dei confisi, beatorum apostolorum Petri et Pauli auctoritate remisimus."—Innoc. PP. II. Epist. 89 (Migne, CLXXX. 127).

"Omnipotentis Dei et beati Petri apostolorum principis auctoritate nobis a Deo concessa."—Eugen. PP. III. Epist. 48 (Ib. p. 1065).

[3] Nos de omnipotentis Dei misericordia et beati Virginis et aliorum sanctorum meritis confidentes."—Henri de Braine, Archbishop of Reims in 1225 (Gousset, Actes etc. de la Province de Reims II. 355). See also pp. 373, 395, 432, 601.

When the Holy Coat of Argentueil was discovered, in 1156, Hugh, Archbishop of Rouen, granted an indulgence "de clementiæ cœlestis plenitudine confisi."—Hugon. Rotomag. Epist. XV. (Migne, CXCII. 1137).

In a very full formula, however, of an indulgence granted by William

of the treasure can be used to prove that priests cannot grant indulgences, but he recognizes that bishops have an independent right; the treasure, he says, is not to be distributed by every one, but only by those who chiefly represent Christ, that is, the bishops, wherefore bishops alone can grant remissions, and among them chiefly the pope, who is the spouse and ruler of the whole Church, for bishops are the spouses of Christ on whom he begets his children.[1] Albertus Magnus makes the first step, for though he acknowledges the episcopal prerogative he assumes that its limitation is at the pleasure of the pope, without which it would be unlimited.[2] The pitiless logic of Aquinas established the papal supremacy. As indulgences were extra-sacramental and no longer a matter of orders but of jurisdiction, and as the treasure required a guardian who would prevent its squandering, the pope alone was its keeper; whoever else dispensed it could only do so by delegation from him, limited as he might see fit.[3] This theory suited too well the centralizing tendency of the time not to be generally accepted, and bishops were held to be merely deputies of the pope, with powers restricted to their commissions from him.[4] It is true that Pierre de la Palu continued to argue that the episcopal power was ordinary and not delegated, but Henry of Hesse, who seems to doubt the generally received doctrine, only ventures to say that it touches a matter which he cannot discuss.[5] Dr. Weigel cites high authorities on both sides of the question and eludes a decision.[6] The

---

Bishop of Durham, in 1284, Peter and Paul are enumerated along with Cuthbert, the Trinity, the Virgin and all other saints, on whose merits reliance is placed.—Bedæ Opp. Suppl. (Migne, XCV. 390).

[1] Alex. de Ales Summæ P. IV. Q. XXIII. Membr. iii.

[2] Alb. Magni in IV. Sentt. Dist. XX. Art. 21.

[3] "Papa enim potest principaliter, alii vero in quantum potestatem ab eo accipiunt, vel ordinariam vel commissam seu delegatam."—S. Th. Aquin. Quodl. II. Art. xvi.—Cf. In IV. Sentt. Dist. XX. Q. iii.; Summæ Suppl. Q. XXVI. Art. iii.

[4] J. Scoti in IV. Sentt. Dist. XX. Q *unic.*—Astesani Summæ Lib. v. Tit. xl. Art. 2, Q. 1.—Durand. de S. Porciano in IV. Sentt. Dist. XX. Q. iii. § 10; Q. v. —S. Antonini Summæ P. I. Tit. x. cap. 3.—Summa Angelica s. v. *Indulgentia* § 5.—Steph. ex Nottis Opus Remissionis fol. 149*a*.—Paulianus de Jobilæo et Indulgentiis p. 131.

[5] P. de Palude in IV. Sentt. Dist. XX. Q. iv. ad 3, Concl. 3.—Weigel Claviculæ Indulgentialis cap. lxiii.

[6] Weigel Claviculæ Indulgentialis cap. liii. A subsidiary question arose which provoked considerable discussion, whether chapters, during a vacancy

pope thus, as the source of all indulgences, could grant commissions to issue them, as Boniface VIII. did, in 1299, to Dominican missionaries sent to the North and the East, and as John XXII., in 1331, to bishops, when he enlarged slightly the powers of those present at the dedication of the church of Poissy.[1] The council of Trent made no direct enunciation on a point so generally conceded, but it assumed the supreme papal authority over the whole matter when it instructed all bishops to investigate the abuses of indulgences in their dioceses, and, after sifting them through their provincial councils, to send the result to Rome, when the pope will decide what is to be done.[2] It is true that an occasional theologian is found to assert that the episcopal power to issue indulgences in the diocese is of divine right. Miguel Medina admits this but subjects it to whatever limitation may be imposed by the supreme papal authority and adds that it only extends to imposed penance. Gröne even argues that it stands on the same footing as that of the pope, and that the bishops voluntarily restricted themselves in its exercise at the Lateran council and can resume it in the same way whenever it may be for the advantage of the Church,[3] but as a rule it is generally admitted, with more or less emphasis, that the pope is the sole source of jurisdiction and of indulgences, and that the functions of the bishops are merely derived from the Holy See, though Palmieri admits that it may not always have been so.[4]

The most important change wrought in the theory and practice of indulgences by the introduction of the conception of the treasure was the extension of the power of remission to souls in purgatory,

---

in the see, could issue indulgences. It was argued in their favor, because it is a matter of jurisdiction and not of orders, and Peter of Palermo decides in this sense (Quadragesimale, De Peccato, Serm. XXVII.), but the eventual decision was adverse.

[1] Ripoll Bullar. Ord. Prædic. II. 59, 193.

[2] C. Trident. Sess. XXV. Contin. Decr. de Indulg.

[3] Mich. Medinæ Disputat. de Indulgent. cap. XVII. XXX.—Dom. Soto in IV. Sentt. Dist. XXI. Q. 1, Art. 4.—Estii in IV. Sentt. Dist. XX. § 6.—Gröne, Der Ablass, p. 44.

[4] Juenin de Sacram. Diss. XIII. Q. iii. cap. 1.—Phœbei de Orig. etc. Anni Jubilæi P. I. cap. iii. (Romæ, 1675).—Privitera Manuale Antistitum, p. 306 (Neapoli, 1890).—Bianchi, Foriero dell' Anno Santo, p. 195.—Van Ranst Opusc. de Indulg. p. 59.—Ferraris Prompta Bibl. s. v. *Indulgentia* Art. II. n. 7. —Gousset, Théol. Moral. II. 902.—Palmieri Tract. de Pœnit. p. 473.

but this is too complex and weighty a subject to be cursorily discussed here, and it can be more conveniently considered hereafter.

It will have been seen from the above that the indulgence is not assumed in any way to be a pardon of sin, but only a remission of a part or all of the temporal *pœna* or penalty remaining after the *culpa* or guilt of the sin has been absolved in the sacrament of penitence. Numerous attempts have been made to define it accurately, which is not an easy matter, for, as in everything else, there has been debate on almost all the points involved, and the complaint has been made that definition is almost impossible, as no two authorities can be found who are entirely in accord.[1] Some of these disputed matters we shall have to consider, and meanwhile a sufficiently clear and concise definition of the view generally accepted at present can be had from Bishop Bouvier—"The remission of the temporal penalty due to actual sins, already remitted as to their guilt; granted externally to the Sacrament of Penance by those who have the power of distributing the spiritual treasure of the Church"[2]

---

[1] Fran. Polygrani de Indulgent. fol. 63; Jo. Capetii Tract. de Indulg. (Amort, II. 156, 163).

[2] Oakley's Translation of Bouvier's Treatise on Indulgences, p. 2 (London, 1848).

This is evidently copied from the definition given by Van Ranst (Opusc. de Indulg. p. 37)—"Pœnæ peccatis quoad culpam remissis debitæ remissio facta extra sacramentum ab eo qui habet spiritualem jurisdictionem dispensandi thesaurum Ecclesiæ."

Nearly the same is the definition given by the Salamanca theologians—"Indulgentia est relaxatio pœnæ temporalis pro peccatis debitæ, ex thesauro Ecclesiæ extra sacramentum facta ab eo qui potestatem habet."—Salmanticens. Append. Tract. VI. Cap. ii. n. 2.

Trullench is nearly as brief (Exposit. Bullæ S. Cruciatæ Lib. I. § 1, Dub. 14, n. 2)—"Actus spiritualis jurisdictionis quo peccator in foro Dei liberatur a reatu pœnæ temporalis extra sacramentum ex applicatione thesauri Christi et sanctorum."

Bellarmine is more elaborate (De Indulgentiis Lib. I. Cap. 1)—"Indulgentias vocant remissiones pœnarum quæ sæpe remanent luendæ post remissionem culparum et reconciliationem in sacramento pœnitentiæ adeptam quos remissiones summi pontifices ex paterna lenitate et condescensione in filios suos, compatientes eorum infirmitati, certis temporibus et non sine aliqua et rationabili causa concedere solent."

Liguori (Theol. Moral. Lib. VI. n. 531) adopts from Busenbaum—"Indul-dulgentia est gratia quæ certo aliquo opere quod concedens præscribit præstito

—except that it omits to specify that, in general, the indulgence must be gained by the performance of some good work enjoined in the grant. Around this comparatively simple formula a vast literature has grown, for in the administration of indulgences many doubtful points arise on which the Church has prudently withheld its decision, giving to the more rigorous and the laxer schools ample opportunity to develop their opposing views.

Besides the distinction, already referred to, between partial and plenary indulgences, they are classified as "real," "personal," and "local," the real being those attached to objects such as medals, rosaries, etc., the personal being those gained on the death-bed or by performing a prescribed pious work, and the local being those conceded to a church or an altar.[1] Plenary indulgences moreover have become complicated by the anxiety of the popes occasionally to render their concessions more attractive and to stimulate flagging zeal by the use of comparatives and superlatives. The earlier crusading indulgences, like that of Urban II., were simply remissions of penance for sin repented and confessed, but as ardor cooled more definite promises were made. When, in 1145, the loss of Edessa threatened the safety of the kingdom of Jerusalem, Eugenius III. promised to all who would serve in Palestine, whether they died there or survived, not only absolution of all sins confessed, but eternal rewards.[2] Alexander III. was more moderate, in 1181, when for a year's service in Syria he remitted only half the enjoined penance, and it required two years to commute the whole, but for those who should die he imposed the pilgrimage as a full penance and promised them the ineffable beatitude of heaven.[3] When, in 1187, on the fall of Jerusalem, Gregory VIII. called Christendom to arms, he promised eternal life to those who should die in penitence and faith, and remission of penance to those who should survive.[4]

---

debita Deo pœna temporalis (non autem culpa) extra sacramentum sacrificium et martyrium, per applicationem satisfactionum Christi et sanctorum remittitur; idque vel per modum absolutionis erga subditos Ecclesiæ vel nudæ solutionis erga non subditos, ut defunctos et catechumenos quibus proinde tantum dantur indulgentiæ per modum suffragii."

[1] Van Ranst, op. cit. p. 83.—Raccolta di varie Indulgenze, p. 25 (Camerino, 1803).

[2] Eugenii PP. III. Epist. (Harduin. VI. II. 1242).

[3] Alex. PP. III. Epist. 1504 (Migne, CC. 1296).

[4] Willelmi de Newburg Hist. Anglican. Lib. III. Cap. xxi. He adds (Cap.

There is a vagueness about all these which reveals the uncertainty as yet existing as to the theory of absolution and the distinction between *culpa* and *pœna*, and this vagueness was still further increased when, in 1199, Innocent III., in a dithyrambic summons for a new crusade, endeavored to surpass his predecessors in the rewards offered. To those who should send substitutes, and to those who should go at others' expense, he promised full pardon of all sins, while for those who bore their own expenses he not only proffered pardon for all sins repented and confessed but an increase of eternal salvation in the reward of the just.[1] What was this increase of salvation he did not stop to explain, but the sounding phrase apparently must have captivated popular imagination and proved effective, for thenceforth it was repeatedly used by his successors when calling for crusaders, either for service in Palestine or in the private quarrels of the Holy See;[2] doubtless the *quæstuarii* or pardoners made full use of it when preaching the indulgences, but no theologian, so far as I am aware, ever ventured an attempt at elucidation or even an allusion to it.

When Boniface VIII., in 1300, tried the experiment of the jubilee and sought to stimulate to the utmost the zeal of the faithful, he invented a new phrase which shows how safe the ecclesiastics of the period felt in audaciously speculating upon the credulity of the ignorant. To the penitent and confessed pilgrims who should come to Rome he promised not only a plenary and larger but the fullest pardon of their sins, and then, after stating the conditions of visits for fifteen days to the basilicas of St. Peter and St. Paul, he added that more frequent and devotional visits would merit more and earn the indulgence more efficaciously[3] The pleonastic *plenissima* was

---

xxiii.) that when Henry II. and his son Richard, and Philip Augustus took the cross in 1188, Clement III. promised that from that day they should have remission of penance of all sins repented and confessed, including forgotten ones.

[1] Innoc. PP. III. Regest. II. 271. "Et in retributionem justorum salutis æternæ pollicemur augmentum."

[2] Innoc. PP. III. Regest. Suppl. 233.—Ripoll Bullar. Ord. Prædic. I. 232, 461, 526.—Nicholai PP. IV. Bull. *Illuminet* § 4, 1 Aug. 1291 (Bullar. I. 168).—Pez Thesaur. Anecd. VI. III. 23.—Joannis Huss Monumenta I. fol. 171 (Ed. 1558).

[3] Bonif. PP. VIII. Bull. *Antiquorum* (Extrav. Commun. Cap. 1 Lib. v. Tit.

not used without consideration, for the jubilee bull was carefully considered and revised in consistory, and a contemporary who was present at one of the discussions reports that the word was debated and decided to mean as full as the power of the keys could be extended.[1] That it produced its effect upon the popular imagination may be inferred from the fact that the pontiffs continued to employ it when they desired to be especially impressive in their crusading and jubilee indulgences, and it has remained in use to the present time. The theologians felt bound to explain it, but admitted their inability to do so definitely. Pierre de la Palu says that one interpretation is that *plena* is confined to mortal sins, *plenior* includes mortals and venials, while *plenissima* remits not only enjoined penance, but all that should be enjoined; or perhaps it may be that *plenissima* removes the *culpa* as well as the *pœna* of venials.[2] The former of these suggestions is quoted by Dr. Weigel, St. Antonino, and Adrian VI., who can throw no additional light on the subject.[3] Rodriguez argues that whatever may have been the case of old, at present the ordinary plenary remits all penance due in any way for all sins, mortal and venial, confessed and unconfessed, and restores the penitent to baptismal innocence; the only advantage of the jubilee indulgence is the absolution for reserved cases, including those of the *Cœna Domini*, except heresy.[4] Lavorio states that the distinction is only verbal, and is so to be reckoned unless the Holy See should decide otherwise.[5] Zerola, on the other hand, says that *plena* removes the penalty for all sins confessed, *plenior* includes venials not confessed,

---

ix.)—"Non solum plenam et largiorem, imo plenissimam omnium suorum concedemus et concedimus veniam peccatorum. . . . Unusquisque tamen plus merebitur et indulgentiam efficacius consequetur quo basilicas ipsas amplius et devotius frequentabit."

[1] Card. Jacobi Gaetani Lib. de Anno Jubilæo Cap. 3 (Max. Bibl. Pat. T. XII. p. 481).—Weigel Claviculæ Indulgent. Cap. xvii.

[2] P. de Palude in IV. Sentt. Dist. xx. Q. iv. Art. 3, Concl. 6.

[3] Weigel Clavic. Indulg. Cap. xvii.—S. Antonini Summæ P. I. Tit. x. Cap. 3.—Adriani PP. VI. Disput. in IV. Sentt. fol. clxiii.—In 1450, Nicholas V. invented another expression to render his jubilee attractive by promising "plenissimam remissionem omnium peccatorum et indulgentiam Jubilæi"—the exact significance of which the theologians vainly endeavored to define.—Steph. ex Nottis Opus Remissionis fol. 10*b*.

[4] Rodriguez, Bolla della Crociata, p. 96.

[5] Lavorii de Jubilæo et Indulg. P. II. Cap. x. n. 63–66 (Romæ, 1625).

and *plenissima* all sins whether confessed or not.[1] Pignatelli strives to show that *plenissima* has the power of releasing from all penalties, in this world and the next, in whatsoever way they may be incurred.[2] Others, like Domingo Soto, Viva, Theodorus a Spiritu Sancto, and Zaccaria, assert that the term is merely a rhetorical exaggeration to commend the indulgence more strongly to the people.[3] Others again, like Bianchi, while admitting that *plena* and *plenissima* are identical—for otherwise the ordinary plenary would be discredited—argue that the popes employ the term for jubilees, because in them there is greater facility, and the indulgence is usually gained more perfectly.[4] It is noteworthy that the pontiffs who invented and have employed the distinction have never seen fit to explain or define it.

The assertion of Boniface as to gaining the indulgence more efficaciously has been no less a puzzle to the theologians. Adrian VI. argued that those who did not do the extra work beyond what was prescribed did not gain the full plenary but only in proportion to their devotion, and this, although it implies that Boniface deceived the pilgrims, is virtually adopted by Azpilcueta, Köninck, and Polacchi.[5]

In considering the nature of indulgences, the first question which suggests itself is what is the actual efficacy attributed to them in their function of replacing satisfaction and releasing the sinner from the pains of purgatory. This has been the subject of endless debate and no little uncertainty. St. Bernard, when preaching the crusade, had no hesitation in promising full pardon to those who assumed the cross; he even argued that God had created this necessity in order

---

[1] Zerola, S. Jubilæi ac Indulgentiarum Tractatus Lib. II. Cap. xvi. (Romæ, 1600).

[2] Pignatelli, Il Giubileo dell' Anno Santo, p. 13.

[3] Dom. Soto in IV. Sentt. Dist. XXI. Q. ii. Art. 1.—Viva de Jubilæo et Indulg. p. 71.—Zaccaria dell' Anno Santo II. 8 (Roma, 1775).—Theodor. a Sp. Sancto Tract. de Jubilæo Cap. I. § iii. n. 6–8.

[4] Bianchi, Foriero dell' Anno Santo, p. 2 26.

[5] Adrian. in IV. Sentt. fol. clxiii.—Azpilcueta Comment. de Jobilæo, Notab. xi.—Polacchi in Bull. Urbani VIII. p. 325. Zaccaria (Dell' Anno Santo, II. 16–17) explains it by the difference between the *ex opere operato* of the treasure and the *ex opere operantis* of the works performed by the penitent.

to have an opportunity of bringing them to eternal glory.[1] Robert of Flammesburg is more cautious; whatever people may say, he tells us, he advises sinners to obtain these remissions, especially if they are laden with sins and penances.[2] Alain de Lille, in parrying the attacks of the heretics, is forced to make admissions which virtually concede that indulgences are valueless; a man on whom penance is enjoined either has charity or has not; if he has not charity, he gains nothing by the indulgence; if he has charity he will perform the penance and not cocker himself by omitting it; but if he dies before the penance is concluded the indulgence will release him from so much of purgatory—which apparently is the only case in which benefit is conferred.[3] Peter Cantor treats the subject in a manner to show how uncertain as yet were all conceptions concerning it; he alludes to Alain's theory, as held by some, while others assert that the effects are immediate, but as to which is true, people, he says, can consult the pope or bishop granting the indulgence; he evidently entertains no favor for them, and relates approvingly how, in 1187, Gregory VIII., at the dedication of a church at Benevento, had said to the crowd "It is better for you to perform penance than for me to remit to you a third or any other part of it."[4] William of Auxerre evidently had little confidence in the system, for he advises the penitent to perform the penance, since he cannot tell how much the suffrage of the Church will help him, and prelates promise much that is not performed.[5] S. Ramon de Peñafort asserts that when the pope issues a plenary indulgence in aid of a crusade, he who gives money can be assured that his penance is remitted both on account of the pious gift and because it secures for him the suffrage of the pope and of the whole Church; but whether one who has a seven years' penance can relieve himself of it by paying the price of seven indulgences of a year each, St. Ramon says he does not know nor can any one tell unless divinely inspired. At the same time he informs us that there were various opinions current; some said indulgences were effective only for sins of ignorance, some that they served for venials, some that they replaced penance negligently performed,

[1] S. Bernardi Epist. 363.
[2] R. de Flammesburg, Pœnitentiale (Amort, II. 33).
[3] Alani de Insulis contra Hæreticos Lib. II. cap. xi.
[4] P. Cantoris MS. Summa de Sacramentis (Morin. de Pœnit. Lib. x. cap. 20).
[5] Guill. Autissiod. Lib. IV. De Relaxationibus (Amort, II. 61).

some that they diminished the pains of purgatory, but the more common opinion, which he himself shared, was that they were worth what they promised—"quod valeant sicut sonant"—all of which shows how vague as yet were the conceptions of the theologians as to this new development of the power of the keys. It is no wonder that S. Ramon's commentator, William of Rennes, taxes him with self-contradiction, especially when he adds that the greater or less remission of penance depends on the greater or less devotion of the penitent as well as on that of those whose suffrage he secures, and also on their number, and as no one can measure these factors no one can tell how much is remitted.[1] In this he started a question which, as we shall presently see, has never yet been definitely settled.

With the introduction of the theory of the treasure the utterances of the theologians gradually became more assured. Cardinal Henry of Susa will admit of no doubt as to the entire efficacy of the plenaries granted by the pope, nor of the power of the priest when dealing with a penitent to render whatever satisfaction he imposes sufficient to replace the pains of purgatory, but he advises those who obtain indulgences to reserve them for use in purgatory and to perform the penance enjoined, for no one knows whether this is sufficing and he is apt to commit fresh sins before he completes the penance for previous ones.[2] Albertus Magnus tells us that some held indulgences to be a pious fraud by which the Church allured the faithful to pious works, but this savors of heresy; others considered them to be worth what they promised, but this goes too far; as a *via media* he prefers to assert that they are worth what the Church represents them to be—but unluckily he does not tell us what this was, except that their value is what it would be estimated by good men, taking into consideration the necessities of the Church and the wealth of the penitent. It is absurd, when a year's indulgence is to be had for a farthing, to assert that a rich man for seven farthings can buy off seven years' penance—but he may be sure that he gets his seven farthings' worth, though this is not as much as the deceivers promise him.[3] It is evident that the problem set by the Church of

---

[1] S. Raymundi Summæ Lib. III. Tit. xxxiv. § 5.

[2] Hostiens. Aureæ Summæ Lib. v. De Remiss. § 8.

[3] Alb. Magni in IV. Sentt. Dist. xx. Art. 17.

reckoning the bliss or bale of the future life in terms of earthly coins was not an easy one. St. Bonaventura is very cool in his estimate of the value of indulgences and prefers to leave the question in uncertainty; they are not worth the same to every one; their value is in accordance with the estimate which he who grants them has or ought to have, and this he is not bound to express, for the faithful ought to believe that the gifts and mercies of the Holy Spirit are granted with equity, nor should any one on account of this uncertainty hesitate to gain them, for if he is in charity he may rest secure that they are always at least worth more than the work prescribed to gain them.[1] Pierre de Tarantaise holds that the current phrase *tantum valent quantum sonant*—that they are worth what they promise—is true, but it is not to be construed literally, for they are worth much more to one man than to another.[2] A still more pregnant factor of doubt is introduced by Bishop William Durand when he says that the remission is good provided the keys do not err and are guided by justice.[3]

Thus far, although the theory of the treasure had been accepted, it had not been applied to the solution of this vexed question. Aquinas seems to be the first to make use of it fearlessly and unflinchingly. After reciting the various opinions current which proportioned the worth of the indulgence to the devotion or the labor of the recipient, or the importance of the cause for which they were offered, he brushes all of them aside. The cause, he says, of remitting punishment by indulgences is simply the abundant merits of the Church; it is neither the devotion nor the labor, nor the amount of alms of the recipient, nor the object for which it is offered. There is therefore no occasion to proportion the remission to any of these, but only to the merits of the Church which are superabundant, and the remission obtained is in accordance with the application of these for the purpose. All that is needed is the authority to dispense the treasure, and anything conducive to the utility of the Church and the honor of God is sufficient reason for granting indulgences; there is no remission of punishment, but only

[1] S. Bonavent. in IV. Sentt. Dist. XX. P. ii. Art. 1, Q. 6.
[2] P. de Tarentas. in IV. Sentt. Dist. XX. Q. iii. Art. 3 (Amort, II. 68).
[3] Durandi Speculi Lib. IV. Partic. iv. De Pœn. et Remiss. n. 12.

the punishment of one is applied to replace that of another, and the latter is completely obliterated.[1]

Thus the perfected theory of the indulgence was at last developed —the *tantum valent quantum sonant*, which has become consecrated by the use of centuries. Yet even the authority of Aquinas was not able to procure its unquestioning acceptance. Men argued that if this were true one ought to devote himself exclusively to obtaining pardons and neglect everything else, to which Astesanus replies that, although they are of high value, there are other works of satisfaction more meritorious as respects the essential reward, which is infinitely better than the mere remission of temporal penalties. For the most part, however, Astesanus accepts the conclusions of Aquinas and cites him as ample authority.[2] Durand de S. Pourçain tells us that the common opinion is that they are worth what they promise, but he thinks it probable that the object for which they are granted must be worthy, such as a crusade to the Holy Land, although he admits that this is not in accordance with custom.[3] Pierre de la Palu accepts the principle fully, and expatiates on their advantage to sinners who frequently relapse, for they thus gain remission at once, which they cannot do in penance constantly neutralized by fresh sins[4]—an argument which shows how ready was the Church to sacrifice the amendment of the sinner in its greed for his "alms." The question evidently was one which occupied men's minds, for St. Birgitta of Sweden had a revelation in which she was told that those who seek indulgences, with the intention of abandoning sin and living according to the will of God, will gain remission of their sins, while to those who have no such intention they at least serve in leading to contrition and confession. Unfortunately a subsequent revelation shows the exaggeration with which the faithful were urged to purchase these easy passports to heaven. God in a vision told her that if a man should die a thousand times for his sake, it would not render him worthy of the slightest share in the glory of the saints, yet indulgences enabled him to participate fully in this glory; thousands of years of life would not suffice for a man to

---

[1] S. Th. Aquin. Summæ Supplem. Q. xxv. Art. ii.; Quodl. ii. Art. xvi.

[2] Astesani Summæ Lib. v. Tit. xl. Art. 2, Q. 1.

[3] Durand. de S. Porciano in IV. Sentt. Dist. xx. Q. iv. §§ 4–9.

[4] P. de Palude in IV. Sentt. Dist. xx. Q. iv. ad 2 Concl. 1.

satisfy God for his sins, but indulgences do this; if a man who has indulgences dies in perfect charity and true contrition, his sins and their penalties are forgiven.[1] Thus charity and contrition had become mere adjuncts to indulgences.

Extravagance such as this might well provoke the reaction voiced by John Gerson. Christ alone could grant such remissions as are hawked around so freely. Yet it is well for pious men to acquire indulgences without inquiring curiously as to their exact value, but to leave it to him who does all things with accurate number, weight, and measure; and he concludes with the significant warning that the most certain sign of salutary indulgence is to do good and to endure evil.[2] A MS. of about the same period, quoted by Amort, is very lukewarm in its estimate of indulgences; they have worth to those who devoutly seek through them to obtain grace, but this is equally true of all other almsgiving, and indeed of all other good works.[3] St. Antonino naturally appreciates them more highly and accepts the definition of Aquinas.[4] Still, in the absence of any authoritative explanation by the Holy See, the schoolmen had full license to exhaust their ingenuity on the mysterious problem and to evolve what results they could. Cardinal Tedeschi, better known as Panormitanus, enumerates as current five theories, mostly different from those alluded to above, but he prefers a sixth, which he says is common, that indulgences are worth what they promise both as respects God and enjoined penance.[5] Angiolo da Chivasso gives the five recited by Panormitanus, together with two more, one of which is that indulgences relieve from the pains of hell, and he follows these with seven more discordant opinions as to the mode and efficacy of their operation, of which he embraces that which asserts that they are worth what they promise in so far as remitting the penance due for sin.[6] It is not worth while to set forth all these varying speculations in detail; their only interest to us is in showing how impossible, after three hundred years of discussion, the schoolmen found it to frame a generally accepted theory concerning them. Stefano

[1] S. Birgittæ Revelat. Lib. IV. Cap. xvi.; Lib. VI. Cap. cii.
[2] Jo. Gersonis Opusc. de Indulg. Consid. X., XII., XVI.
[3] MS. Pollingan. (Amort, II. 114).
[4] S. Antonini Summæ P. I. Tit. x. Cap. 3, § 3.
[5] Steph. a Nottis Opus Remissionis, fol. 150*a*.
[6] Summa Angelica s. v. *Indulgentia* §§ 1, 2.

Notti contents himself with enumerating four theories, and concluding that indulgences relieve from penance, provided the Church is not deceived.[1] Prierias gives the customary array of opinions and adopts that of Aquinas.[2] Adrian VI. tells us that the value of indulgences is an old subject of debate and is still in doubt.[3]

The council of Trent prudently avoided any definition beyond the general assertion that indulgences are salutary in the highest degree, coupled with an anathema for those who pronounce them useless or that the Church has no power to grant them.[4] When, in 1574, S. Carlo Borromeo instructed his flock to gain the jubilee indulgence of 1575, he laid special stress on confession and contrition and works of devotion and charity. He said little about the efficacy of the indulgence in releasing them from temporal penalties, but much of self-conquest, of mastering their passions, of forgiving their enemies and of earning by a new life the apostolic benediction which they were going to obtain. But when, in 1576, the jubilee was, as usual, extended to the local church, he pointed out its benefits more precisely, assuring them that it would relieve them from the obligation of satisfying either on earth or in purgatory for every sin committed since baptism.[5] Soon after this Willem van Est summarizes the current opinions in a manner to show how persistently the doubts and discussions maintained themselves. Three of these theories he dismisses as erroneous and savoring of heresy, but two of them have each its own probability and the support of weighty authorities. The first is that indulgences are worth only what the cause for which they are granted weighs in the divine estimation, the other is that of Aquinas, commonly accepted, that they are worth what they promise, provided there is reasonable cause. In support of the latter is the custom of the Church which grants for the same cause sometimes large and sometimes small indulgences, and indeed sometimes very great ones for trivial causes, and to weigh them by the unknown divine estimation would be to cast them in doubt and to

---

[1] Steph. a Nottis Opus Remissionis fol. 146*a*.

[2] Summa Sylvestrina s. v. *Indulgent.* §§ 6, 7.

[3] Adriani PP. VI. Disput. in IV. Sentt. fol. clix. col. 2 (Romæ, 1522). "Quid valent hujusmodi relaxationes vetus quærela est, sed adhuc satis dubia."

[4] C. Trident. Sess. XXV. Contin. Decr. de Indulg.

[5] S. Carlo Borromeo, Lettere Pastorali sopra il Giubbileo.

ascribe deceit to the Church. Yet it is much more probable that a small cause, even if reasonable, does not suffice for a large indulgence, but the one must be proportionate to the other, and it cannot be worth more than the cause is estimated in the judgment of God. After all this however he is forced to admit that it is not easy to define the practical working of this proportion, and it must be left to the prelates to whom Christ granted the power of deciding. It is true that the pope may err, but so long as the error is not manifest the faithful must presume that in this as in other matters he has exercised true judgment[1]—all of which is a tacit admission of human impotence in attempting to exercise the functions of God. Very similar is the view of Juenin, who tells us that nothing is more injurious than indiscreet and superfluous indulgences, but when prudently granted their effect is infallible.[2]

These doubts might vex the minds of the learned and thoughtful, but they were not commonly taught to the people. Quarti asserts that if the works enjoined are duly performed the effect of the indulgence is infallible *ex opere operato*, and Pignatelli declares that the remission of punishment is certain, for the treasure is infinite and the papal power to distribute it is undoubted.[3] The popular belief in this is deplored, towards the middle of the last century, by Padre Feyjoo, who endeavors to refute the generally entertained vulgar error that any one obtaining a plenary indulgence in the manner prescribed by the bull of the Santa Cruzada will enjoy remission of the temporal punishment of all his sins. He enumerates the endless distribution of indulgences, both plenary and partial, which, he argues, is wholly incompatible with the common belief in their efficacy, and he points especially to the inconsistency of the universal custom of obtaining plenary indulgences for the souls of those who already have had them on the death-bed[4]—the inevitable weakness of his argument being its assumption that human reason has anything to do with the matter, and his failure to remark that in this way the Church profits by selling the same remission twice over. Giunchi follows the same line of thought in indicating the practical

[1] Estii in IV. Sentt. Dist. xx. § 10.

[2] Juenin de Sacramentis Diss. xiii. Q. iii. Cap. 2; Q. iv.

[3] Quarti, Trattato del Giubileo, p. 33.—Pignatelli, Il Giubileo dell' Anno Santo, p. 14.

[4] Feyjoo, Cartas, Tom. I. n. 45.

distrust manifested by those who, although on the death-bed they obtain several indulgences, nevertheless provide for masses and pious works to be performed for their souls.[1] In a fit of candor Andreucci explains that the Church does not deem it opportune to define in what consists the benefit of indulgences; the faithful are not to inquire too curiously into it, but must be content with the simple belief that they are useful and beneficial.[2] The most that Palmieri ventures to say is that the indulgence is infallible if the keys do not err; in such case it remits all the penalties before God, and he rejects the argument of those who urge that as penance is of divine precept it cannot be wholly set aside.[3] Gröne admits that indulgences are not necessary to salvation, for the penitent can perform the penance imposed on him, but they are the shortest and surest mode of rendering satisfaction. Besides they serve as a sort of insurance against worldly misfortunes—"that injury, that loss, that sickness, that conflagration, that inundation, perhaps would have been spared us if by obtaining the indulgences offered we had released ourselves from the punishment incurred by sin."[4] In reviewing these vague and various theories we need scarce wonder that their natural effect is, as Father Hörmann informs us, that many Catholics have incorrect conceptions as to indulgences, some attributing to them too much and others too little power—that the jubilee is regarded as magic which through some secret miraculous influence will restore to innocence the most sinful and relieve him at once from the consequences, internal and external, of his sins, so that in place of morals being improved they are greatly corrupted.[5] That such belief should prevail among the uneducated is perhaps not surprising, for, amid all the conflicting opinions recited above, there is one point on which all the authorities appear practically to agree, though it is the most absolute expression of the power of indulgences. This is, that if a sinner properly gains a plenary indulgence and dies before he has

---

[1] Giunchi de Indulgentiis, p. 173. In fact, we are told that plenary indulgence at death is no reason for omitting subsequent efforts for the soul of the departed—Lavorii de Jubilæo et Indulg. P. II. Cap. x. n. 120.

[2] Andreucci de Requisitis etc. ad lucrandas Indulgentias, p. xxii.

[3] Palmieri Tract. de Pœnit. pp. 476, 483.

[4] Gröne, Der Ablass, pp. 143, 167.

[5] Hörmann, Ablass- und Jubiläums-Predigten, I. 24–5 (Dritte Auflage, Regensburg, 1869).

the opportunity of committing sin his soul flies at once and direct to heaven.[1]

Alongside of the discussions which we have followed there has been a perennial debate on the question started by S. Ramon de Peñafort, when he asserted (p. 45) that the penitent gains an indulgence only in proportion to the zeal and devotion which he brings to the acquisition. As no condition or limitation of the kind is expressed in the grants of indulgence, many eminent doctors deny this proposition on the ground that if it were true the Church would be deceiving the faithful in its promises, which they hold to be impossible.[2] Others of equal authority accept it; St Bonaventura says however that it is not fit to be openly taught, as it is desirable that the faithful should believe the gifts of the Holy Ghost to be equally distributed, but this caution did not weigh against the fact that the zeal and devotion were apt to find tangible expression in the amount of the almsgiving.[3] Again, there were theologians who distinguished between indulgences for fixed terms of penance and plenaries or those which remitted a third or other part of penance, the reason given being that the devotion with which one man would have performed the hundred days or year remitted is greater than that of

[1] Jo. Friburgens. Summæ Confessor. Lib. III. Tit. xxxiv. Q. 182.—S. Antonini Summæ P. I. Tit. x. cap. 3 § 1.—Summa Rosella s. v. *Indulgentia* § 16.—Steph. ex Nottis Opus Remissionis, fol. 10*a*.—Quarti, Trattato del Giubileo, p. 245.—Onofri, Spiegazione della Bolla della S. Crociata, p. 221 (Napoli, 1778).—Raccolta di varie Indulgenze, pp. 20–1 (Camerino, 1803).

The most authoritative work on indulgences is the "Raccolta di Orazione e Pie Opere," issued under the auspices of the Congregation of Indulgences. In the edition of 1886 (p. xi.) the assertion is made in the most absolute manner "se dopo avere acquistata una Indulgenza Plenaria ci tocasse la sorte di morire, direttamente anderemmo al Paradiso." Singularly enough, in the edition of 1855 (p. x.) a less confident statement had been made by presenting it as the belief of the theologians—"affermano i Teologi che etc."

[2] S. Th. Aquinat. Summæ Supplem. Q. xxv. Art. 2.—Durandi de S. Porciano in IV. Sentt. Dist. xx. Q. iv. § 6.—Estii in IV. Sentt. Dist. xx. § 10.

[3] S. Bonavent. in IV. Sentt. Dist. xx. P. ii. Art. 1, Q. 6.—Guill. Durandi Speculi P. IV. Partic. iv. De Pœnit. et Remiss. n. 11.—Steph. ex Nottis Opus Remissionis fol. 148*b*.—Adriani PP. VI. in IV. Sentt. fol. clxii.—Azpilcuetæ Comment. de Jobilæo notab. xv. n. 15.—Layman Theol. Moral. Lib. v. Tract. vii. cap. 4, n. 2.—Van Ranst Opusc. de Indulg. p. 65.—Palmieri Tract. de Pœnit. p. 476.

another, and consequently the value of the indulgence is greater to him.[1] There is still another theory, that while warmer devotion does not serve to gain more in remission of the penalty, yet the grace and the glory obtained are proportionate.[2]

A more puzzling question is whether the plenary indulgence is equally good for those whose sins are markedly unequal—whether the same trifling observance required to gain it will remit the penalty incurred for a life spent in heinous crime as effectually as it does with the comparatively trivial offences of the average devotee. Practically such a distinction cannot be drawn, and the ordinary teaching is that the indulgence serves equally for all.[3] Yet Padre Feyjoo pronounces such a doctrine absurd, and that it betrays many into a false and most dangerous sense of security.[4] Sylvius endeavors to solve the difficulty by arguing that a man burdened with many and grave sins, unless he has deeper fervor has less of the disposition requisite, and does not obtain the full benefit of the plenary.[5] Cardinal Lugo tries to reach it in another way by pointing out that the cause of the indulgence may be sufficient in the case of the little sinner, but insufficient in that of the great one, so that the latter only gains in reality a partial, and Palmieri appears to accept this.[6]

There has been some debate also as to the subject of forgotten sins. Dr. Amort tells us that at first they were not covered by indulgences, and that the first allusion to them occurs in one granted by Gregory XI. in 1373, prior to which theologians considered them as excluded.[7] This is not correct, for we find them mentioned in episcopal indulgences as early as 1178 and 1195, and in 1188 Clement III. includes them in the crusading indulgence granted to Henry II. and Philip Augustus.[8] These are evidently special graces,

[1] P. de Palude in IV. Sentt. Dist. xx. Q. iv. ad 2, Concl. 1.—Summa Sylvestrina s. v. *Indulgentia* § 8.

[2] Summa Angelica s. v. *Indulgentia* § 2.—Quarti, Trattato del Giubileo, p. 49.

[3] P. de Palude in IV. Sentt. Dist. xx. Q. iv. Art. 3, Concl. 6.—Bianchi, Foriero dell' Anno Santo, p. 110.

[4] Feyjoo, Cartas, Tom. I. n. 45.

[5] Fr. Sylvii Q. II. Concl. ii. (Amort, II. 178).

[6] Palmieri Tract. de Pœnit. p. 476.

[7] Amort de Indulgent. II. 235.

[8] Gousset, Actes de la Province de Reims, II. 313.—Cœlestin. PP. III. Epist. 222 (Migne, CCVI. 1106).—Willelmi de Newburg Hist. Anglic. Lib. III. Cap. xxiii.

whence we may conclude that forgotten sins were not covered unless thus enumerated, but already the question had arisen, for Peter Cantor asks whether, when a man obtains an indulgence for one-third of his penance, the penalty which may be due in purgatory for what he has forgotten in confession is included.[1] The constant tendency to enlarge the scope of indulgences gradually caused forgotten sins to be covered, for, as we have seen, it was taught that a soul which in dying had received a plenary flew at once to heaven, which infers that the penalty for all sins was remitted, whether they had been confessed or not, and even when the grant read that it was for sins confessed—a formula frequently employed—Prierias tells us that opinions were divided whether forgotten sins are included, and Lavorio holds that they are not.[2] This question is avoided in modern indulgences, which simply prescribe repentance and confession, and thus, of course, forgotten sins are included.

A more serious question suggests itself with regard to the reimputation of sins. We have seen (I. p. 506) that the Church has never been able to determine whether or not relapse into sin undoes the work of previous absolutions and renews the guilt which had been washed away. If this be the case it must similarly annul all previous indulgences, and the soul must be exposed to all the temporal penalties from which it had been released. The matter is one on which, so far as I have observed, writers on indulgences, for the most part, preserve discreet silence. Bianchi, however, thinks that the indulgences are not cancelled; if they are, the remedy is to procure a new absolution and a fresh indulgence, and therefore it is well for a man to be always endeavoring to get new ones, and be thankful that the Church is always ready to grant them.[3]

The subject of the efficiency of indulgences cannot be dismissed without considering one aspect of it which has caused an immense amount of discussion—whether they have power to release from the *culpa* or guilt as well as from the *pœna* or penalty left after the pardon of the guilt. Theoretically it would seem that there could

[1] P. Cantor MS. Summa de Sacramentis (Morin. de Pœnit. Lib. x. Cap. 20).

[2] Summa Sylvestrina s. v. *Indulgentia*, § 22.—Lavorii de Jubilæo et Indulg. P. II. Cap. x. n. 53.

[3] Bianchi, Foreiro dell' Anno Santo. p. 187.

be no question concerning it, for the pardon of guilt is effected in the sacrament, and the indulgence only purports to remit the temporal penalty. Yet for ages there was a widespread popular belief that plenary indulgences were *a culpa et a pœna*, and this belief was a considerable factor in contributing to the large revenues which the Holy See drew from their sale throughout Europe.

To understand properly the points involved it is necessary to recur to the earliest efforts of the popes in the eleventh century to turn to practical account the power of the keys. That power as yet was vague and undefined; the sacramental theory had not yet been invented nor the distinction drawn between the *culpa* and the *pœna*, with its corollary that absolution by remitting the *culpa* changed the eternal pains of hell to the temporary suffering of purgatory, and that this again was commuted into the performance of penance. All this was as yet in the future; reconciliation had not become absolution, absolution might mean anything, from a prayer to a pardon, while purgatory was still only a speculation. The sinner could be received back into the bosom of the Church in return for any service that he might be called upon to perform, and it was easy to make vague promises, the fulfilment or non-fulfilment of which could never be tested, while their very vagueness served to excite the popular imagination of an ignorant age. The earliest instance I have met with of such rudimentary indulgences occurs in the proceedings of the council of Narbonne in 1054, which, in its efforts to enforce the Truce of God, invokes for those who shall faithfully observe it the sempiternal blessing of Christ and the inheritance of eternal life.[1] This is a sort of precatory indulgence *a culpa et a pœna*, for no repentance and confession are prescribed—the mere fact of not violating the truce is represented as sufficient to counterbalance all sins. An advance is seen in 1063, when Alexander II., desiring to encourage a projected expedition against the Saracens of Spain, instructs those taking part in it to confess their sins and accept a measure of penance lest the devil may be able to accuse them of impenitence, but, by the authority of St. Peter and St. Paul,

[1] "Omnes qui eam tenuerint et fideliter observarint benedictionem sempiternam ab ipso Jesu Christo Domino et Salvatore nostro percipiant et hæreditatem æternæ vitæ sine fine possideant."—C. Narbonnens. ann. 1054, Cap. 4 (Harduin. VI. i. 1034).

he removes the penance and remits their sins, following them with his prayers.[1] This is virtually *a culpa*, for the only absolution is what he grants. The formula, moreover, is of interest as showing that at this time the remission of sin—*remissio peccatorum*—meant its pardon, and not merely release from penance, as we shall see the modern theologians argue. The phrase "for remission of sin" was familiar to ecclesiastics from its frequent use in grants to churches, as we have already seen (II. p. 157), and it naturally found its way into documents of this kind, which were as yet in the experimental stage, though sometimes we find absolution and sometimes pardon (*venia*) substituted as equivalent terms. Ideas on the subject were as yet altogether vague, and the papal scriveners had not adopted a settled formula. Thus Gregory VII., in 1074, sends to Remedius, Bishop of Lincoln, who had requested it, "absolution" from all his sins, conditioned on his contrition for them, and on his rendering in the future his body a fitting habitation for God; neither confession nor penance is prescribed, so that this may be regarded as an irregular personal indulgence *a pœna*. Yet how little power he then claimed is manifest in another document of the same year, in which, exhorting Christians to succor their Eastern brethren, he assures them that a momentary labor will earn an eternal reward. It is the work which will secure salvation, and he does not pretend to grant it himself.[2] Somewhat more like an indulgence, and evidently intended in some way as such and as a favor, is the commission given by Gregory, in 1076, to the Bishop of Acherenza to absolve from their sins, if they perform penance, Count Roger of Sicily and his soldiers, who are about to fight the Saracens.[3] In 1080, however, Gregory boldly granted indulgences *a culpa et a pœna*. When Arnoul of Flanders despoiled Theodoric, Bishop of Verdun, he stimulated the faithful to come to the bishop's assistance by granting to all the apostolic benediction and promising pardon of

[1] Löwenfeld Epistt. Pontiff. Roman. ined. p. 43.—"Qui juxta qualitatem peccaminum suorum unusquisque suo episcopo vel spirituali patri confiteatur, eisque, ne diabolus accusare de inpenitentia possit, modus penitentiæ imponatur. Nos vero auctoritate sanctorum apostolorum Petri et Pauli et penitentiam eis levamus et remissionem peccatorum facimus, oratione prosequentes."

[2] Gregor. PP. VII. Regest. Lib. I. Epistt. 34, 37.

[3] Gregor. PP. VII. Regest. Lib. III. Epist. 11.

sins, without conditioning it on repentance or confession.[1] So, in excommunicating Henry IV., he grants absolution of all their sins to all who will support Rodolph of Suabia, Henry's competitor, imposing on them no other condition.[2] There was no reason, in fact, why he should not do this, if the grant of the keys to St. Peter and their transmission to the papacy were to be construed literally. Impliedly, in 1084, he made the same offer to all the faithful who would succor the persecuted St. Peter and mother Church.[3] In 1087 Victor III. recurs to the remission of all sins, apparently without conditions, to stimulate an expedition against the Saracens.[4] Similarly, in 1091, Urban II. grants the grace and benediction of God and the apostles and remission of sins to Count Roger of Sicily and his wife, children, and soldiers.[5] How vaguely and how indiscriminately these high-sounding phrases were used is exhibited in the occasional salutatory at the commencement of papal epistles—"Health and absolution of all sins by the apostolical benediction."[6]

The uncertain meaning attached to the phrase "remission of sins" is shown by the fact that contemporaries use it to describe the indulgence granted at the council of Clermont, in 1096, to the crusaders, which was only a remission of penance.[7] On the other hand, when Robert the Hierosolymitan of Flanders, after his return from the first crusade, at the bidding of Paschal II., ruthlessly devastated the

---

[1] Ibid. Lib. VII. Epist. 13.—"Ei nos apostolicam benedictionem tribuimus et de divinæ pietatis munere confisi peccatorum suorum veniam pollicemur."

[2] Concil. Roman. VII. ann. 1080, Cap. 7. In the excommunication, addressed to St. Peter, Gregory says: "Ex parte vestra dono, largior et concedo omnibus sibi fideliter adhærentibus absolutionem omnium peccatorum, vestramque benedictionem in hoc vita et in futura vestra fretus fiducia, largior.

[3] Gregor. PP. VII. Epist. Extravagant. 64 (Migne, CXLVIII. 710).—"Per omnipotentem Deum adjuvate et succurrite prædicto patri vestro et matri si per eos absolutionem omnium peccatorum et benedictionem atque gratiam in hoc sæculo et in futuro habere desideratis."

[4] Chron. Casinens. Lib. III. Cap. 70.

[5] Amort de Indulg. I. 189. I have not been able to verify this, which Dr. Amort quotes from the Bollandist life of St. Agatha.

[6] "Salutem et omnium peccatorum absolutionem per apostolicam benedictionem."—Gregor. PP. VII. Regest. Lib. IV. Epist. 3; Epistt. Extravag. 31, 44.

[7] Fulcherii Carnot. Hist. Hierosolymit. Lib. I. cap. 1.—Berthold. Constantiens. Annal. Ann. 1096.

Cambresis to punish its loyalty to Henry IV., Paschal wrote, warmly thanking him and ordering him to treat Liége in the same way, in remission of the sins of himself and his marauders.[1] The construction put on this is found in an eloquent and touching protest by the church of Liége, written by Sigebert of Gemblours. It expresses horror at learning that the slaughter and desolation perpetrated at Cambrai had been by order of Paschal; it asserts that no authority can be found for such an act, save when Hildebrand commanded the Countess Matilda, in remission of her sins, to make war on Henry; and it winds up by pointing out that no condition of penitence and confession is imposed as a prerequisite of impunity for past sins and liberty of future ones[2] "In remissionem peccatorum" therefore was understood to be an indulgence *a culpa et a pœna*. The same may be assumed of the remission of sins promised, in 1122, by the first council of Lateran to those who would serve in the Holy Land, as there is no allusion to repentance, confession or penance.[3] When, however, after the fall of Edessa, Eugenius III. again summoned Christendom to arms, in 1145, the progress of theology called for greater precision in the use of the keys. The confused ideas still current as to their functions are seen in his promising both remission and absolution of sin, but at the same time he is careful to limit the indulgence to sins which have been repented and confessed, thus practically only releasing the penitent from penance.[4] As the sacra-

[1] Paschalis PP. II. Epist. 88 (Migne, CLXIII. 108).

[2] Harduin. VI. II. 1771 sqq. "Unde ergo hæc nova auctoritas per quam reis sine confessione et pœnitentia affertur præteritorum peccatorum impunitas et futurorum libertas? Quantam fenestram malitiæ per hoc patefecisti hominibus! Te, O mater, liberet Deus ab omni malo!"

[3] C. Lateran. I. ann. 1122, Cap. 11 (Harduin. VI. II. 1112).

[4] Eugenii PP. III. Epist. 48 (Migne, CLXXX. 1065).—Harduin. VI. II. 1242-3, 1261.

It would be interesting to trace in detail, did space admit, the use of the formulas "remissio peccatorum" and "in remissionem peccatorum." The former long continued to mean a plenary indulgence; the latter speedily came to be scarce more than a rhetorical flourish, which might mean anything to the grantee, while binding the grantor to nothing. As early as about 1170 Alexander III. thus orders prelates to exhort the people to make collections for the Templars "in remissionem peccatorum suorum" (Pflugk-Harttung, Acta Pontiff. Roman. ined. I. n. 298). In 1179 the third Lateran council ordered the people, "in remissionem peccatorum omnium," to take up arms against the Albigenses, but it only offered release of two years of enjoined penance for the

mental theory became developed and the distinction was established between *culpa* and *pœna*, of which only the latter could be removed

service (C. Lateran. III. ann. 1179, cap. 27). In 1185 Lucius III. summons the people of Berry, Tours, Sens and Reims, "in remissionem peccatorum," to aid with alms the repairs of St. Martin of Tours, and offers no other reward (Löwenfeld Epistt. Roman. Pontiff. ined. p. 227). In 1188 Clement III. offers thirty days' indulgence for contributions to the hospital of Stagno, near Pisa, to aid in building a bridge, and he summons the people to aid "in remissionem peccatorum" (Pflugk-Harttung, *op. cit.* III. n. 408). In 1192 Odo Bishop of Toul orders the faithful "in remissionem peccatorum suorum" to seize and bring to him all Waldenses (Martene Thesaur. IV. 1180). In 1233 Geoffroi Bishop of Amiens enjoins "in remissionem peccatorum" the inmates of the hospital of Amiens to observe the rules more strictly (Gousset, Actes de la Prov. de Reims, II. 371). In 1245 Innocent IV. orders all prelates "in remissionem peccatorum vestrorum" to permit the questors of the church of Bethlehem to preach an indulgence which he had given it (Berger, Registres d'Innocent IV. n. 980), and he uses the same formula in commanding the Portuguese to set aside Sancho II. and place his brother Affonso on the throne (Raynald. Annal. ann. 1245, n. 71). So, in 1262, when Urban IV. instituted the feast of Corpus Christi he enjoined its celebration on the clergy "in remissionem peccatorum" (Urbani PP. IV. Bull. *Transiturus* § 3). When, in 1298, Boniface VIII. rushed into the quarrel with the Colonnas and raised an army, as he says, to exterminate them as rebels and schismatics, being in want of money, he turned upon the Templars and Hospitallers and demanded of them 10,000 florins each and of the Teutonic Knights 1000 marks. To soften the illegal demand he assured them that the payment would be "in remissionem peccaminum" (Digard, Registres de Boniface VIII. n. 2426–8). So, in 1310, when Clement V. ordered Edward II. illegally to torture the captive Templars he assured the king that compliance would be in remission of his sins (Regest. Clement. PP. V. T. V. pp. 455–7). What the exact virtue of the formula may be has never been defined, but that it is held to mean something, at least when reinforced by the power of the keys in the sacrament, is shown by its use in absolution "quicquid boni feceris et mali sustinueris sit tibi in remissionem peccatorum" etc.

Yet when there was a promise of "remissio peccatorum" or "venia peccatorum" it meant a plenary indulgence, as in the crusading indulgences of Innocent III. and the fourth council of Lateran (Innoc. PP. III. Regest. x. 149; xi. 26, 158; Suppl. Epist. 233), those granted by Innocent IV. for aiding inquisitors and by Alexander IV. for crusades (Ripoll. Bullar. Ord. Prædic. I. 242, 356). The phrase is still employed, as in a decree of April 9, 1863, "Omnium peccatorum suorum indulgentiam et remissionem misericorditer in Domino concedimus" (Decr. Authent. S. Congr. Indulgent. n. 751). Thus the Church has retained the ancient formula of absolute pardon of sin long after it had become a commonplace of the schools that sin is only pardoned by God in the sacrament. This self-contradiction is felt to require explanation. About

by the indulgence, the formulas became more precise, and towards the end of the twelfth century we find introduced the expressions "*vere pœnitentibus et confessis*" or "*corde contritis et ore confessis*," to express the limitation of the indulgence to those who were contrite and had obtained absolution from the *culpa* in the sacrament. The expression employed by the council of Lateran, in 1216, when calling for a new crusade, shows how careful was the Church to render it clear that only on such conditions could the sinner gain the benefit of the indulgence, "we grant them full pardon of the sins of which they have been truly contrite at heart and which they have confessed with the mouth."[1] It is important to bear this in mind, for the utmost care was employed in the framing of grants of indulgence. The axiom, accepted by the schoolmen, that they were worth exactly what they promised, led to the most rigid scrutiny of every word and phrase to determine precisely the character and conditions of the grant, and whenever there was an ambiguity it was earnestly debated in every possible aspect.

Yet while thus it was admitted that the direct action of indulgences was merely the remission of penance, there was claimed for them an indirect benefit, even for the unrepentant and unabsolved sinner. St. Ramon de Peñafort argues that, through the application thus made of the prayers and suffrages of the Church, the sinner acquires primal grace which he could not merit of himself, and, after the discovery of the treasure, Albertus Magnus ascribes the

1365 Pietro, Bishop of Orvieto and papal vicar, in MS. notes on the *Liber Pontificalis*, calls attention to the formula and remarks that the canons say nothing about it, nor could Urban V., who caused inquiry to be made, find any records concerning it (Palmieri Tract. de Pœnit. pp. 456-7). In 1451 Cardinal Nicholas of Cusa assumes that it is entirely different from indulgences *a culpa et a pœna* (Mag. Chron. Belgic. ann. 1451). Modern writers are at some pains to explain that remission of sin only means remission of penance after the sin has been remitted (Polacchi Comment. ad Bull. Urbani VIII. p. 91.—Viva de Jubilæo ac Indulg. p. 77.—Kenrick Theol. Moral. II. 249.—Palmieri Tract. de Pœnit. p. 472). Gilles Charlier, at the council of Bâle, in answering the Hussites, had advanced this opinion "salvo judicio meliori" (Harduin. VIII. 1793).

[1] C. Lateran, IV. *ad calcem* (Harduin. VII. 78), adopted also by the first general council of Lyons, in 1245 (Ibid. p. 895).—"Plenam suorum peccaminum de quibus veraciter fuerint corde contriti et ore confessi veniam indulgemus."

same grace to the application of the merits of Christ.[1] It is true that Aquinas denies even this, asserting that indulgences are of no benefit to those in mortal sin, and that no power exists in pope or bishop to grant remission in such cases,[2] but while this might be admitted in theory, various causes were at work to neutralize it in practice. By this time, as we shall see hereafter, the issue of indulgences was almost exclusively a financial expedient. It had been found that they could be used to secure large contributions, and they were resorted to whenever there was a necessity of money for some special object; the collecting of these funds had become an organized business, in which *quæstuarii* or "pardoners" were employed—mostly priests who had little scruple as to the means by which they could most successfully market their wares. An indulgence which would release from hell as well as from purgatory, which required neither repentance nor amendment, was a much more saleable article than one which was good only for those who had truly repented, confessed their sins and been absolved, and the peripatetic vendors through whom nearly all the trade was conducted never hesitated as to the representations necessary to attract customers. It mattered little what might be the theories of the schools, the people wanted indulgences *a culpa et a pœna*, the demand created the supply, and they were furnished with what they wanted, or with what they were told was what they wanted, whether the terms of the concession warranted the assertion or not. The theologians might assert it to be impossible, for God alone could pardon the *culpa;* the ignorant masses believed that what they purchased were free pardons of sin, nor could they appreciate, even if they ever heard, the subtle reasoning which demonstrated that "remission of sin" only meant remission of penance for pardoned sin, nor when they were told that it was well even for those in mortal sin to gain indulgences, could they understand how it merely disposed them to penitence *de congruo* through which, by the mercy of God, they could acquire remission of sin.[3]

Thus there was a universal popular belief that indulgences could

---

[1] S. Raymundi Summæ Lib. III. Tit. xxxiv. § 5.—Alb. Magni in IV. Sentt. Dist. XX. Art. 18.

[2] S. Th. Aquin. Summæ Suppl. Q. XXXVII. Art. 1.—Summæ contra Gentiles Lib. IV. Cap. lxxii.

[3] Astesani Summæ Lib. V. Tit. xl. Art. 5, Q. 1.

liberate both from the guilt and the punishment. Before the theory of the treasure had been fairly worked out, about 1260, Thomas of Cantimpré alludes to the remission of *culpa* and *pœna* to be gained by pilgrimage to the Holy Land or elsewhere; he admits that one who takes the cross and is truly repentant and confessed, if he dies in the service will be liberated, but he contrasts this with the redemption of the crusader's vow granted for ten or five or even one per cent. of the personal property of the sinner and the sanctifying letters so lavishly distributed for trifling sums by the papal legates, while the monk or friar cannot gain the same reward by ceaseless austerities and vigils.[1] A contemporary chronicler, describing the council of Lyons in 1274, says that Gregory X. there ordered the cross preached throughout Europe, pardoning guilt and punishment to all who took it.[2] The Blessed Peter of Palermo in his sermons feels called upon to confute those who assert that indulgences are conceded *de pœna et culpa* by pointing out that not even the pope can remit sins without the sacrament either had or intended.[3] It was the fashion to attribute this popular impression to the lies of the *quæstuarii*, as was done by the council of Vienne in 1312,[4] but the Holy See cannot be entirely relieved of the responsibility. As early as 1253 Innocent IV., in ordering a crusade preached in France to aid Louis IX., at that time a prisoner in Egypt, offers in great detail plenary indulgences to those who go and full pardon of sins to those who contribute, without expressing any condition as to contrition and confession; in 1257 Alexander IV. grants in the same way plenary indulgences to inquisitors, and in 1265 Clement IV. does the same in stimulating the crusade of Charles of Anjou against Manfred of Naples.[5] These were, to all intents and purposes, indulgences *a culpa et a pœna*, which fully

[1] Th. Cantimprat. de Bono Universali Lib. II. Cap. ii.

[2] "Perdonando colpa e pena a chi la prendesse, o andasse o mandasse."—Ricordano Malespini Historia Fiorentina, Cap. 199 (Muratori, S. R. I. VIII. 1020).

[3] Pet. Hieremiæ Quadragesimale de Peccato, Serm. 20. For the high reputation as a theologian of Peter Jeremiah of Palermo, see Touron, Grands Hommes de l'Ordre de S Dominique III. 304. He died in 1452.

[4] Clement. Cap. 2 § 1, Lib. V. Tit. ix.—"Et aliqui ex ipsis eos a pœna et a culpa, ut eorum verbis utamur, absolvant."

[5] Ripoll. Bullar. Ord. Prædic. I. 231, 356, 461.

justified the pardoners in representing them as such to the people. The curious confusion which existed on the subject was manifested when the ignorant anchorite, Pier Morrone, was elevated to the papacy as Cœlestin V. in 1294, and was consecrated on the feast of the Decollation of John the Baptist in the church of S. Maria of Collemadio, when he promptly granted to the church that all who should visit it on that day, truly repentant and confessed, should receive an indulgence *a pœna et a culpa* for all sins committed since infancy.[1] The phrase evidently was one which was in frequent use, and the theologians tried to neutralize it by assuming that it meant nothing, for about this time Agostino da Ancona and Durand de S. Pourçain say that the pope can grant indulgences *a pœna et a culpa*, though the context shows that a state of grace is assumed to be necessary.[2]

If any impulse was lacking to strengthen the popular belief that pardon of sin could be granted and gained irrespective of contrition and the sacrament, it was furnished by the promises of Boniface VIII. in proclaiming the jubilee of 1300. A contemporary writer, who was there, speaks of it as an indulgence *a culpa et a pœna*, while others assume that it was gained by the simple visits to the basilicas of St. Peter and St. Paul, without alluding to any conditions of contrition and confession.[3] Even Dante, who was too familiar with

[1] Raynald. Annal. ann. 1294, n. 14. Raynald quotes it on account of its unusual form, and adds that Boniface VIII. on his accession revoked it and ordered the punishment of all who should endeavor to gain it, but, as we shall see, indulgences productive of money are hard to kill, and, in 1402, it was still in existence, for Boniface IX. included it with the Holy Sepulchre, Compostella, the Portiuncula, etc., and withdrew all indulgences granted in imitation of them.—Reg. Cancellar. Bonif. PP. IX. n. 72 (Ottenthal, Reg. Cancell. Apostol. p. 76).

[2] Aug. de Ancona Lib. de Potest. Eccles. Q. XXII. Art. iii. (Amort, II. 76). —Dur. de S. Porciano in IV. Sentt. Dist. xx. Q. iv. § 10.

[3] The Chronicon Astense describes the jubilee indulgence "ut quisque Christianus . . . per dies XV. visitando omni die ecclesias Beatorum Apostolorum Petri et Pauli liber sit a die baptismo ab omni peccato suo, tam a culpa quam a pœna."—Muratori, S. R. I. XI. 191.

Bernard Gui, who was fully acquainted with the exact meaning of words, says that "Bonifacius papa concessit plenam indulgentiam omnium peccatorum omnibus visitantibus limina apostolorum Petri et Pauli et facientibus ibi quindenam infra annum ipsum.—Vit. Bonif. VIII. (Ibid. I. 671).

Amauri Augier states "dedit et concessit plenissimam peccatorum indulgen-

the theology of the period to make a mistake in such a matter, assumes that the jubilee indulgence was *a culpa* and liberated from hell—not *a pœna* which liberated from purgatory those who escaped hell by the sacrament—when at Easter, 1300, he represents the angel, whose office it is to carry souls to purgatory, as having for three months accepted all comers.[1] In the jubilee of 1350 there was the same belief that the pardon granted was *a culpa et a pœna*. The author of the life of Cola di Rienzo so describes it; St. Birgitta, who visited Rome to gain it, represents a companion who fell sick as saying that it was reported that absolutions *a culpa et a pœna* were to be had there; and Henry of Rebdorff, who likewise went thither, describes it as "*plenam remissionem culpæ et pœnæ*."[2] The phrase by this time had become so generally in use that the Glossator on the Clementines asks what are these indulgences that are conceded *a pœna et a culpa*, and replies that they are the *plenissimæ* which are granted to crusaders and at the jubilees;[3] while during the agonies of the Black Death, in 1348, the dying were soothed with the belief that Clement VI. had granted through confessors power to absolve *a pœna et a culpa*.[4] Wickliffe explains that the popes grant indulgences only to those repentant and confessed, but the friars who hawk them around suppress this condition, to the great injury of morality, for the people believe that for a trifling sum they can obtain pardon of all crimes.[5] The Creed of Piers Plowman tells

---

tiam omnibus Christifidelibus qui infra illum annum limen Apostolorum Petri et Pauli visitarent et per quindecem dies visitando ipsa et alia sanctuaria ibi starent."—Vita Bonif. VIII. (Ibid. III. II. 437).

Giov. Villani alludes to confession but not to repentance, and shows the confusion of thought by describing the indulgence as *a culpa et a pœna*—"a tutti fece piena e intiera perdonanza di tutti i suoi peccati, essendo confesso o se confessasse, di colpa e di pena."—Cronica Lib. VIII. Cap. XXXVI.

[1] Veramente da tre mesi egli ha tolto
Chi ha voluto entrare con tutta pace.—*Purgatorio*, II.

[2] "Quum Pontifex Clemens VI. Romanis universalem culpæ et pœnæ indulgentiam per unius anni curriculum impertivit."—Vit. Nicholai Laurentii Lib. III. Cap. 1 (Muratori Antiq. VII. 874).

"Fama inquit est quod in hoc loco est absolutio a culpa et pœna."—Revelat. S. Birgittæ, Lib. VI. Cap. 102.—Heinrici Rebdorff Annales ann. 1350 (Freher. et Struvii I. 631).

[3] Steph. ex Nottis Opus Remissionis fol. 156–7.

[4] Contin. Guill. de Nangiaco ann. 1348.

[5] J. Wicklif Trialogi Lib. IV. Cap. XXXI. When alluding, however, to the

the same story—that the people were led to believe that they obtained pardon of the guilt as well as of the penalty[1]—and, in 1395, the author of a tract against the Waldenses asserts that these reckless promises led many good Catholics to waver in faith as to all indulgences.[2] In fact, no further evidence than language is required to show us what was the popular belief, for indulgences were known as pardons, and the traders in them as pardoners wherever throughout Europe the Romance idiom had penetrated.

The natural influence of the Great Schism was to increase the prevailing demoralization. The needs of the rival papacies were increased while the area from which contributions could be drawn was divided and there was less scruple than ever in exploiting it to the utmost. Boniface IX., who put up everything for sale from archbishoprics to the inferior offices of the curia, and who sold the same preferment two or three times over when he could, was not likely to hesitate as to the means by which the sale of indulgences could be rendered more productive. His predecessor, Urban VI., before his death, in 1389, had proclaimed a jubilee for 1390, of which Boniface proceeded to reap the fruits as energetically as possible. The first jubilee, in 1300, had been strictly confined to pilgrims visiting Rome. In 1350 Clement VI. had commenced modestly to make exceptions by allowing the jubilee indulgence to be gained without the pilgrimage to Rome. Boniface IX. devised the productive expedient of sending out commissioners empowered to publish it and to sell it for what the journey to Rome and back would cost. Emissaries engaged in such work were not likely to be over-nice as to the terms, and they freely offered pardon

---

indulgences granted by Urban VI. against his competitor, Clement VII., Wickliffe seems to throw the responsibility on the pope—"For they seien that thei han power of Crist to assoile alle men that helpen in her cause, for to gete this worldli worshipe to assoile men of peyne and synne bothe in this world and in the tothir, and so whanne they dien, flee to hevene withouten peyne." —Serm. LXVII. (Arnold's Select English Works I. 210).

[1] The power of the Apostells they pasen in speche,
For to sellen the synnes for silver other mede,
And purlyche *a pena* the puple assoileth,
And *a culpa* also, that they may katchen
Money other money-worthe and mede to fonge.
—Pierce the Ploughman's Crede (Early English Text Soc. p. 27).

[2] Ps. Pilichdorffius contra Waldenses, Cap. 30 (Max. Bibl. Pat. XIII. 329).

for sins without requiring any formalities, sacramental or otherwise. They returned to Rome in great pomp, with sumptuous retinues, some of them having collected as much as 100,000 florins in a single province. Not all of them rendered a faithful account of their stewardship, which led Boniface to issue a bull wherein he deplored their excesses in granting indulgences to the unrepentant and unconfessed, and promising eternal bliss in this world and the next, though he had no scruple in keeping the money thus acquired, while he ordered those who did not account to him to the last penny to be tried by the inquisitorial process and forced to disgorge. Many of them he cast into prison, where they perished by an evil death, some of them doubtless under torture, while others were torn in pieces by the Roman mob, apparently angered at the instruments of a device enabling the Barbarians to gain the indulgence without coming personally to Rome.[1] Boniface's pretended indignation at the audacity of his agents in selling indulgences *a culpa et a pœna* did not prevent him from continuing the traffic. After the jubilee year was over he devised a scheme for prolonging it, and during 1391 and the following years he granted jubilee indulgences to churches and cities throughout Italy and Germany until there was no place so small that had not enjoyed them, the pope reserving to himself a share of the proceeds and sending agents to supervise the collections. We are told that these indulgences were not *a pœna et a culpa*, but that they were so represented to the people and as requiring neither repentance nor confession, which led some pious souls to doubt their genuineness.[2] Apparently there were places where the consciences of the priests would not permit this barefaced deceit and a compromise was made of requiring repentance and confession, while at the same time the indulgence was represented as being *a culpa et a pœna*, for by this time it would seem that the people would buy nothing else.[3] Boniface seems to have yielded at last to this demand, for, in

[1] Raynald. Annal. ann. 1390, n. 2.—Theod. a Niem de Schismate Lib. I. Cap. 68.

[2] Gobelini Personæ Cosmodrom. Æt. VI. Cap. 86.—P. Langii Chron. Citizense ann. 1395.—Corio, Historie Milanese, P. III. ann. 1391.

[3] Hist. de Landgraviis Thuringiæ Cap. 138 (Pistor. et Struvii I. 1357). A very curious instance of this condescension to the popular demand occurs in the documents (printed by Amort, I. 87–90) of the jubilee preached in Augsberg in 1451, after that of Rome, in 1450. Confession is required to a con-

1402 we find him revoking all indulgences containing the clause *a pœna et a culpa*, or "plena indulgentia omnium peccatorum suorum,"[1] showing that such were in existence. This revocation, however, was only a further speculative device, for having thus cleared the market he proceeded to supply it again with fresh issues. Platina, who seeks to excuse him, while admitting that his reckless sale of plenaries debased the authority of the keys and of the Holy See, assures us that he wished wholly to recall them, but was prevented by the greed of his kindred.[2]

It is an evidence of the tendency of the period to laxity that about this time John Capreolus, a Dominican professor at the University of Paris, known as the prince of Thomists, seriously argued that the pope has power to pardon the *culpa* as well as the *pœna*.[3] The Church was hardly prepared to accept a doctrine so subversive of the theory of the sacraments, but it ventured as near to it as it could. At the council of Constance the writer of an anonymous tract in answer to the Hussite Jacobel of Mies, quotes William of Montlun to the effect that the pope, as the spouse of the Church, has power to remit both the guilt and the penalty; he tells us that the papal indulgences were commonly known as *a pœna et a culpa*, and he justifies this by assuming that it is the papal power which remits both in the sacrament.[4] When theories of this kind were in the air it need not surprise us to see that when, in 1309, the council of Pisa, vainly attempting to heal the Schism, elected Alexander V., the new pope granted to all the members of the body and to all who would accept its action, an *absolutio plenaria a pœna et culpa*, subject to no conditions, except that it could be had within three months *in forma ecclesiæ*.[5] This latter was a shrewdly devised phrase which, hidden among the clauses of an indulgence,

---

fessor delegated by the bishop, the price is one-half of the cost of the pilgrimage to Rome, divided equally between the bishop and pope, in return for which is granted "omnium peccatorum suorum plenissimam remissionem," which the good bishop explains "quæ vulgo a pœna et culpa appellari consuevit."

[1] Reg. Cancell. Bonifacii PP. IX. n. 72 (Ottenthal, Regulæ Concellariæ Apostolicæ, p. 76).—Gobelini Personæ Cosmod. Æt. VI. Cap. 87.

[2] Vita Bonifacii PP. IX. (Muratori S. R. I. III. II. 832).—B. Platinæ Vit. Bonifacii IX. (Ed. Colon. 1574, p. 249).

[3] Amort, II. 178.

[4] Von der Hardt, Concil. Constant. III. 688.

[5] C. Pisan. ann. 1409, Sess. XXIII. (Harduin. IX. 24).

might escape attention, or, if observed, might be subject to such interpretation as the vendor might please to put on it. It has continued occasionally in use to the present day. Pius II. employed it, in 1459, when for his projected crusade he levied a thirtieth of all incomes in Italy, and to those who should pay honestly and promptly he granted a plenary remission of all sins *in forma consueta ecclesiæ*.[1] In 1485 it is even introduced in granting a partial indulgence during the canonization of St. Leopold of Austria by Innocent VIII.,[2] and it is occasionally to be found in modern canonizations.[3] The exact meaning of the phrase has never been authoritatively defined. Caietano tells us that in all *viva voce* indulgences it is understood, even if not expressed, and that it means not only the condition of true repentance and confession, but also that only enjoined penance is covered, while Beringer says that it signifies that the indulgence is for the truly repentant who have been relieved of *culpa*.[4]

Although the council of Constance accused John XXIII. of scandalizing the Church by selling indulgences *a culpa et pœna*, and he pleaded guilty to the charge,[5] it would appear that he was more careful of appearances than his predecessors. The indulgence published, in 1412, for the crusade against Ladislas of Naples, the vending of which in Prague aroused the opposition of John Huss, and was the proximate cause of the Bohemian troubles, bears the condition that it was only for the truly repentant and confessed. The commissioners however, as usual, made unlimited promises; they guaranteed heaven to those who bought it, and threatened those who did not with hell. The burden of Huss's assault was the pardon *a culpa et a pœna*, which was not in the bull, and with which the people were deceived. Yet the absolutions which were granted professed to be only for sins confessed, though, with the contradiction of terms so well calculated to hoodwink the multitude, it concluded with a remission *a pœna et a culpa* for all sins.[6] It is quite possible

[1] Conventus Mantuanus ann. 1459 (Harduin. IX. 1448).

[2] Innoc. PP. VIII. Bull. *Sacrosanctam* § 16 (Bullar. I. 452).

[3] In that of S. Hiacinta de' Mariscotti by Pius VII., in 1803 (Pii PP. VII Bull. *In evangelica* § 26).—In that of St. Josaphat Kuncewicz by Pius IX., in 1867 (D. Bartolini Comment. Actorum omnium Canonizationis, Romæ, 1868, II. 328).

[4] Caietani Tract. XV. *De Indulgent.* Cap. vii.—Beringer, Die Ablässe, p. 89.

[5] C. Constant. Sess. XI. (Harduin. VIII. 348–9).

[6] Jo. Huss Monumenta, Ed. 1558, fol. 171, 180, 186–7. The formula of ab-

(From the Original in the Whi



e Historical Library, Cornell University, N. Y.)



that these incongruous formulas were adopted to avert hostile criticism, while satisfying the desire of the people for indulgences *a pœna et culpa*, nor was it difficult to reconcile the apparently incompatible phrases. In cases such as the Roman jubilee or the Portiuncula, the crowd of applicants must have rendered the confession a mere formality, destitute of all sacramental value. When the indulgence was supplied by the peripatetic papal commissioners, the matter was quite as readily managed, for they were accompanied with a retinue of priests who served as confessors and who would not be likely to damage the sale of their wares by interrogatories or by asking for more than the purchaser cared to say. The whole matter was in the hands of the pardoners, who, provided they obtained the sum affixed to the indulgence, would allow the customer to do what he liked in the matter of confession.[1]

---

solution is "Et etiam autoritate apostolica mihi concessa absolvo te ab omnibus peccatis Deo et mihi vere confessis et contritis. Ex quo personaliter præsens negotium non vales perficere velisque facere juxta commissariorum et meam ordinationem, præsidium et auxilium ad prædictum negotium consequendum tuo pro posse fecisti, do et concedo tibi plenissimam remissionem omnium peccatorum tuorum, quæ est a pœna et a culpa. In nomine etc."

Amort (II. 38) prints a more elaborate formula, used in 1433, of which the first portion is like an ordinary absolution for sins repented and confessed, and the conclusion is "do et concedo tibi plenissimam indulgentiam cum remissione pœnæ et culpæ, ut in conspectu Divinæ Majestatis et æternæ gloriæ valeas feliciter pervenire. In nomine" etc.

[1] This is well illustrated by two indulgences, of which, through the kindness of the custodians of the White Historical Library at Cornell University, I am able to give fac-similes in the Appendix. The first is one issued by the council of Bâle, in 1438, to raise funds to carry out its invitation to the envoys sent from Constantinople to negotiate for the reunion of the churches—indulgences which continued to be sold after Eugenius IV. had captured John Palæologus and his patriarch for the rival council of Ferrara and Florence. It is granted under the authority of Henry Meng, doctor of decretals and canon of Zurich, commissioner of the council for the dioceses of Bamberg, Würzburg, Eichstadt, Augsburg and Regensburg, and is given to Friar John, Prior of the Carthusian house of St. Mary of Nürnberg. It recites his contribution to the good work, for which it bestows on him a faculty to absolve fully once in life, and again at death, all the members of his convent from all penalties and censures, under a formula which carefully prescribes the conditions of contrition and confession, being good only for sins confessed or forgotten.—"Dominus noster Jhesus Christus per meritum suæ passionis dignetur te absolvere et ego auctoritate sanctæ matris ecclesiæ ac sacrosancti Basiliensis synodi de hac parte mihi commissa te absolvo ab omni sententia excommunicationis suspen-

In the projects of reform of the council of Constance the abusive sale of indulgences was naturally included; this was attributed to the laxity caused by the Schism and was denounced as heartily as by Wickliffe or Huss. It was proposed that all indulgences issued since the council of Vienne (1312) should be annulled, but all that it was able to obtain from Martin V. was that more caution should be observed in future, that all, except perpetual ones, granted since the death of Gregory XI. (1378) should be revoked as well as all *de pœna et culpa* or *de plena remissione*, conceded to churches, and

sionis et interdicti a jure vel ab homine prolata, etiam sedi apostolicæ specialiter reservata. Et plene te restituo sacramentis ecclesiæ et conditioni fidelium. Et eadem auctoritate absolvo te ab omnibus quibuscumque peccatis culpis et negligentiis mortabilus et venialibus de quibus corde contritus es et ore confessus et de quibus libenter confitereris si tibi ad memoriam venirent, et remitto omnem pœnam pro eis tibi debitam, ac illam plenariam remissionem hac vice tibi impertior quam ecclesia concedere solet omnibus Romam tempore jubilæi vel crucesignatis ad recuperationem Terræ Sanctæ tempore passagii generalis euntibus. In nomine Patris et Filii et Spiritus Sancti amen."

In marked contrast with this is the other—a confessional letter, issued in 1482, under a bull of crusading indulgence, by Sixtus IV., in 1480. It grants to the recipient the right to choose a confessor who can absolve him from all sins, however enormous, as often as he wishes, though those which are reserved to the pope can be absolved only once, and to grant him full remission and indulgence once during life and again at death. Then follows the formula of absolution, showing that it was customary to perform this at once, by the pardoner or one of his assistants. It reads—"Misereatur tui omnipotens deus etc. Dominus noster ihesus cristus per suam piissimam misericordiam te absolvat. Et auctoritate ejus et beatorum Petri et pauli apostolorum ac Sanctissimi domini nostri pape michi commissa et tibi concessa, ego te absolvo a vinculo excommunicationis si incidisti et restituo te sacramentis ecclesie ac unioni et participationi fidelium. Et eadem auctoritate te absolvo ab omnibus et singulis criminibus delictis et peccatis tuis quantumcumque gravibus et enormibus. Etiam si talia forent propter que sedes apostolica consulenda esset, ac de ipsis eadem auctoritate tibi plenariam indulgentiam et remissionem confero. In nomine patris et filii et spiritus sancti Amen.

"Nota quod in mortis articulo adjungenda est hec formula. Si ab ista egritudine non decesseris plenariam remissionem et indulgentiam tibi eadem auctoritati in mortis articulo conferendam reservo."

This is xylographic. I have another, printed from type, of the year 1483, in precisely the same form. It is observable that not a word is said as to contrition or as to the indulgence being for sins confessed. The contrast between the two is noteworthy and explains why the people were eager for indulgences *a culpa et pœna*, and how these could be reconciled with the formality of a sacrament.

(From the Original in the White Historical

Forma confel

Pateat vniuersis presentes litteras inspecturis · Qualiter dcu
dioces ad opꝰ sancte cruciate p Sācissimū in xpo pīez et
ordinatum debitam fecerit ꝯtributionē · Quapropter auctori
sibi confessorem presbiterum ydoneum religiosum vel secular
possit auctoritate p̄dicta ab oīb̄ cōmissis per eum excessib
Et tiā si talia forent ꝓpter que sedes apostolica esset cōsulend
A iure vel p statuta quecūq; promulgatis et sedi aplice reseru
totiens quotiens id petierit · Ac semel in vita et in mortis arti
et remissionem impendere · Non obstātibus quibuscūq; reser
fectis prout in bulla data · Ō · CCCC · LXXX pridie non
continetur · In cuius rei fidem et testimoniū Ego frater petr
rum subcommissarius eiusdem sanctissimi dñi nostri Sixti p
litteras fieri feci · Et sigilli cruciate impressione munīri · Am

·Forma absolu

Misereatur tui omnipotens deus ꝛc · Dominus nost r ihesu
uat · Et auctoritate eiꝰ et beatoꝝ Petri et pauli aplorum ac Sā
te absoluo a vinculo excommunicationis si meruisti et restitu
Et eadē auctoritate te absoluo ab omnibus et singulis crim
enoꝝnibus · Etiam si talia forent propter que sedes apostoli
riam indulgentiam et remissionem confero · In nomine pat
¶ Nota qꝺ in mortis articulo adiungenda est hec clausula · ꝑ
onem et indulgentiam tibi eadem auctoritate in mortis articul

Library, Cornell University, N. Y.)

ſionalis·

ot ⁊m xp̃o

ñm nr̃m dñm Sixtũ diuina p̃uidẽtia papã quartũ
tate preſata dominũ noſtr̃ ⁊pe p̃tat̃ hñt eligendi
ẽ· qui audita diligenter eius confeſſione abſoluere cum
us et peccatis quibuſlibet quantumcũq; enormibus·
a· Et a cenſuris et penis ac excõicationibus omnibus·
utis ſemel dumtaxat· A non reſeruatis vero eidem ſcõi
culo plenariã omnium peccatorũ ſuorum indulgentiã
lationibus a p̃fato pontifice· vel eius predeceſſoribus
as dcẽbris pontificat9 eiuſdem anno decimo plenius
9 Bardian9 ⁊ p̃dicator9 dñet9 thoma cen· ordinis minno
xapc quarti ſuper· preſato negocio deputatus preſentes
o dñi· M·CCCC·LXXXij Die

tionis·

s criſtus per ſuam pijſſimam miſericordiam te abſol
ciſſimi dñi nr̃i pape indã cõmiſſa et tibi cõceſſa· ego
o te facinẽtis eccl̃ie ac vnioni et partícipacõi fidelĩ·
nibus delictis et peccatis tuis quãtũcũq; grauibus et
a ſuleda eſſet· ac de ipſis eadem auctoritate tibi ple-
ris et filij et ſpiritusſancti Amen·

Si ab iſta egritudine non deceſſeris plenariam remiſſi-
o conferendam reſeruo·

also all *ad instar*.[1] Martin V. carried out the agreement in the rules for his chancery published the day after his election. Various limitations on the issue of indulgences were prescribed, among which was that any letters granting them *a pœna et culpa* to persons, under the seals of the cardinals or anyone else, should be null and void.[2] There was a convenient vagueness about this, and the profitable business of furnishing the people with what they demanded went on. In 1427 Gerson felt it necessary to demonstrate that the power of the keys could not supersede the sacrament,[3] and in 1433, at the council of Bâle, Gilles Charlier, in answering the Taborite Nicholas, could only say that indulgences *a culpa et a pœna* were not in the ordinary style of the curia, wherefore, if there were such, they presumably were obtained surreptitiously.[4] There were such unquestionably, though the old contradiction was kept up, for in 1440, at the Carmelite General Chapter held at Asti, Eugenius IV. granted to all truly contrite and confessed, who should visit the church and make a suitable donation, a plenary indulgence and remission of all sins "tam a pœna quam a culpa"—an offer which attracted four thousand applicants.[5] This desire to carry water on both shoulders—to meet the popular demand for indulgences *a culpa*, while keeping up a show of respect for the requisites of contrition and confession—gave the theologians no little trouble. These perplexities are well illus-

[1] Von der Hardt I. 753.—C. Constant. Sess. XLIII. Cap. xiv. (Harduin. VIII. 883). In the reformatory canons printed by Von der Hardt (V. 1533) this one is omitted, but the action of Martin V. shows that it was adopted as agreed upon.

Indulgences *ad instar* were those which simply specified the grant as the same as that enjoyed by some noted church—St. Peter's, the Portiuncula etc. It had the advantage of indefiniteness, and enabled those in charge to claim whatever they chose, leading to abuses which the council sought to check.

[2] Von der Hardt I. 980–1.

[3] Jo. Gersonis Opusc. de Indulg. Consid. I.

[4] Orat. Carlerii in Con. Basil. (Harduin. VIII. 1793). There is a somewhat different version of this passage in Canisius et Basnage (IV. 620) which may be the correct one. It admits the existence of such indulgences and endeavors to explain them away.

[5] Chron. Astens. ann. 1440 (Muratori S. R. I. XI. 276). A similar contradictory indulgence was granted, in 1476, to the monastery of San Salvador de Breda, of which the price varied according to the station of the applicant, from twenty-five silver reales for a king to one real for a common person.—Villanueva, Viage Literario, T. XIV. p. 304.

trated by Dr. Weigel. He asserts that God alone can pardon the guilt, but he admits that there were indulgences afloat *a culpa et a pœna;* he tells us that plenary remission is the same as absolution *a culpa et a pœna*, that Henry of Bitterwald and some others argued that the pope could grant such indulgences, and that Landulph of England held that indulgences are authoritative and not merely compensatory, while in one passage he admits that the pope can remove both the guilt and the penalty, and in another he mentions the theory of some doctors that there are two kinds of *culpa*—one against God, which God alone can remit, the other against the Church, which is subject to the power of the pope.[1] Evidently the action of the curia and the superstition of the people had got beyond the capacity of the theologians to explain. St. Antonino attempts it by asserting that the popular expression *a culpa et a pœna* applied to plenary indulgences is incorrect, and yet it may be justified by the condition of contrition and confession required for them: he warns the people that, as indulgences are worth exactly what they promise, the terms must be carefully scrutinized and followed in order to gain them.[2] Cardinal Nicholas of Cusa was somewhat more explicit when, in 1451, he came to Germany as papal legate and proclaimed a jubilee indulgence wherever he went. At Magdeburg he held a synod, in which he explained that these indulgences were plenary remissions of sin, but were not *a culpa et a pœna*, for the Holy See never granted such[3]—a somewhat overbold assertion, for, with the complete secularization of the papacy, the popes were growing more reckless and had little hesitation in making any promises deemed necessary to accomplish the object in view. When, in 1459, Pius II. endeavored to organize a crusade, he offered to all who would go or send a fighting-man a *plenissima* indulgence in which there was no condition of contrition or confession;[4] the sacrament was wholly superseded, and it was to all intents and purposes *a culpa et a pœna*. It was the same when, in 1470, Paul II. proclaimed the jubilee to be held in 1475, and when, in 1473, his successor, Sixtus IV. confirmed it; the fullest pardon of all sins is promised to all Christians

[1] Weigel Claviculæ Indulgent. Cap. i. xiii. xxiii. xxxv. xlii. Conclusio.
[2] S. Antonini Summæ P. I. Tit. x. Cap. 3, § 4.
[3] Mag. Chron. Belgic. ann. 1451.
[4] Convent. Mantuan. ann. 1459 (Harduin. IX. 1446).

visiting the basilicas without a word implying that it is conditioned on repentance and confession.[1] It is true that soon after this Angiolo da Chivasso combats the opinion that indulgences can remit the pains of hell, and Gabriel Biel repeats the assertion of St. Antonino that the popular use of the term *a culpa et a pœna* is false; but Baptista Tornamala, though in one passage he says the people are mistaken in believing that they remove the *culpa*, in another he accepts the dictum of Giovanni da Imola that when the pope grants a full remission of all sins it is *a culpa et a pœna*.[2]

Thus the power of the indulgence to remit both the guilt and the penalty was gradually winning its way, and in view of the financial advantages of such a doctrine it would in all probability have established itself, and the sacrament of penitence would have grown obsolete had the Church been left to its own devices and not been forced to a reform by the revolt which its degradation rendered inevitable. It is true that Alexander VI., in specifying the details of his jubilee of 1500, alludes to true repentance and confession,[3] but Stefano Notti, in his semi-official exposition of the indulgence, easily disposes of this by quoting the Gloss on the Clementines to the effect that, if strictly construed, there would be few who would gain indulgences, and therefore it is not fitting to interpret it rigidly; to be sure, the sinner must repent, but as for confession it suffices if he had confessed the year previous and intends to confess next year. Besides, he tells us that the jubilee is commonly called an absolution *a pœna et a culpa*, and the very title of his book—*Opus remissionis a pœna et culpa*—shows the dominating spirit of the business and the impression which the authorities desired to produce.[4] The jubilee was a failure, and probably Alexander considered that he had been too exacting, for when, in 1502, he extended it to Germany, he was careful to impose no conditions except the payment of money; the services of a priest were only called in to administer the absolution thus purchased, and the purchaser acquired the right,

---

[1] Pauli PP. II., Bull. *Ineffabilis* § 7 (Bullar. I. 386).—Cap. 4 Extrav. Commun. Lib. v. Tit. ix.

[2] Summa Angelica s. v. *Indulgentia* § 1.—Gabr. Biel in IV. Sentt. Dist. XLV. Q. iii. Art. 1.—Summa Rosella s. v. *Indulgentia, in corp.* §§ 19–20.

[3] Alex. PP. VI. Bullæ *Inter curas multiplices; Pastoris æterni* (Amort, I. 95–6, 96–101).

[4] Steph. ex Nottis Opus Remissionis, fol. 8*b*, 11*a*.

during life, to select the one who should perform this function.[1] Nor was this confined to the jubilee. In 1508 the Franciscan Anselm, in his description of the Holy Land, tells us that at Bethlehem, in the church of the Virgin, there was the altar where Christ was circumcised, which enjoyed a plenary indulgence *a pœna et culpa*.[2] In fact, another writer of about the same period says that the comprehensive rule at the Holy Places was that wherever there was no cross there was an indulgence of seven years and seven quarantines, and wherever there was a cross there was a plenary indulgence *a pœna et a culpa*, all granted by St. Sylvester at the request of Constantine and St. Helena.[3] How complete had become the belief in the papal power to remit both *culpa* and *pœna* is manifested in the conditions agreed upon, in 1503, in the conclave which elected Pius III., which the pope to be chosen should swear to observe. Among them is one requiring the future pontiff to absolve all the cardinals from all crimes, however enormous, that they may have perpetrated, including specially reserved cases. This absolution is to be good in both the secular and ecclesiastical courts, and each cardinal is to be rendered as innocent as when he came from the baptismal font. That this was an indulgence *a culpa et pœna* is proved by a subsequent clause providing that, if any cardinal shall prefer to make confession, he shall have free choice of a confessor who shall have full faculty for reserved cases.[4]

When, in 1510, Julius II. issued the fateful St. Peter's bull *Liquet omnibus*, which seven years afterward was destined to excite Luther's revolt, he put up for sale with cynical boldness almost everything that the Church could offer attractive to sinners, and licensed almost everything that the Church was organized to repress. In the pre-

[1] Amort, I. 101. Geiler von Kaysersberg, preaching before the papal legate in 1502, is puzzled to explain the indulgences offered *a culpa et a pœna*. He suggests that an indulgence *a pœna* is one for ordinary sins, and that when it includes papal reserved cases it is *a culpa*, but he submits this without prejudice to a better opinion and urges his hearers to acquire it without inquiring too curiously into its exact meaning.—Navicula Pœnitentiæ, fol. lxxx. (Aug. Vindel. 1511).

[2] Anselmi Descript. Terræ Sanctæ (Canisii et Basnage IV. 779). As the site of the stable only had a plenary indulgence (Ib. p. 780), Anselm evidently drew a distinction between them.

[3] Amort de Indulg. II. 518.

[4] Bergenroth, Calendar of Spanish State Papers, I. lvii , 311.

liminary recital of a former commission granted to Geronimo Torniello there is an allusion to repentance and confession, but in the commission now granted to Francisco Zeno this is not repeated, and the only condition prescribed to all Christians for gaining the indulgence is to deposit in the chest the price determined by the commissioner or his delegates. If the sinner desires to choose a confessor to administer the absolution he can do so for an additional payment, and if the confessor imposes a "salutary penance," this again is money to be devoted to the fabric of St. Peter's.[1] The whole document is evidently drawn with the purpose of enabling the pardoners to represent it as an indulgence *a culpa et a pœna*, and is redolent from beginning to end with the odor of filthy gain. Leo X. was even more reckless. In September, 1513, he proclaimed a crusade against the Turks which he promised to lead himself; in this indulgence there is no condition of contrition and confession, unless it be covertly inferred from a reference to the Holy Land and jubilee indulgences granted by his predecessors; he promises not only full remission of all sins but reconciliation with the Most High, and decrees that all who go or send substitutes or contribute according to their means shall be associated with the angels in eternal bliss.[2] No more complete power over *culpa* could well be asserted. Moreover, in many of the local plenary indulgences which he granted there is no allusion to confession and repentance, while in others these are specified, and the natural explanation of the distinction is that he charged more for one form of grant than for the other, and that the church applying for the concession took its choice.[3] The

[1] Julii PP. II. Bull. *Liquet omnibus*, 11 Jan. 1510, §§ 2, 7, 8, 14 (Bullar. I. 502). In contrast with this is an indulgence issued, in 1511, by Julius to rebuild the church of Constance, which had been partially destroyed by fire. All who pay the sum fixed by the delegates and devoutly visit a church are granted the jubilee indulgence, but this only enables them to select a confessor who can absolve them of all sins "de quibus corde contriti et ore-confessi sunt."—(Amort, I. 209.) Evidently the distinction was well understood, and the more marketable indulgences were reserved for the benefit of Rome, or the concessions were held at a higher price.

[2] Raynald. Annal. ann. 1513, n. 111.

[3] Hergenröther Leonis PP. X. Regest. n. 2312–13, 3444, 7745, 9053, 9134, 9191, 9201, 9311–13, 9889, 10730–1, 11414–19, 11791, 11836, 11853, 13852, 14447, 16840, 17421.

There is a sort of compromise in a plenary indulgence in favor of the Hos-

commissioners who sold these indulgences were therefore not without justification when they assumed to have power over hell as well as over purgatory, and in their absolution formula assured the purchaser that they closed for him the portals of hell and opened the gates of paradise.[1] Father Dudík points out that in two vernacular summaries of the indulgences of the Teutonic Order (including some plenaries), drawn up in 1466 and 1513, the clause found in an earlier one, requiring contrition and confession, is omitted.[2] Thus Erasmus evidently was guilty of no exaggeration when he described the wicked as tossing from their evil gains a coin for an indulgence, and then, thinking their sins all wiped out, engaging in fresh ones.[3]

Luther's protest, in 1517, showed that the abuses of the system were arousing an opposition among independent thinkers which called in question the whole theory on which it was based. Caietano made haste to prove that subjection to the temporal penalty implies remission of guilt, and this can only be granted to those truly repentant and confessed.[4] Prierias admits that some authorities hold that indulgences enable mortal sinners to obtain grace, but he argues that plenaries are wrongfully styled by the people *a pœna et a culpa*, for God alone can remit the *culpa* to the contrite; but the plain people might well be misled by theological subtilties, involved in the assertion of his reply to Luther, that the pope by the key of orders can remit all the *culpa* and by the key of jurisdiction all the *pœna*.[5]

---

pital of the Holy Ghost at Nürnberg, granted, in 1517, to all who have confessed or intend to confess, and who will devoutly visit the church of St. Sebald or of the Holy Ghost between *Lætare* Sunday and Easter, and give as much as they commonly spend in a day for food or drink. A fac-simile of the controlling portion of this will be found in the Appendix.

[1] In a formula of absolution given to those who contributed to the hospital of Santo Spirito in Saxia there occurs the clause "remittoque tibi omnes pœnas in purgatorio debitas, claudo tibi portas inferni et januas aperio paradisi."—Widemanni Chron. Curiæ ann. 1516 (Menkenii S. Rer. Germ. III. 757).

[2] Dudík, Ueber Ablasstafeln, pp. 174–5 (Wien, 1868).

[3] Erasmi Encom. Moriæ (Ed. Tauchnitz, II. 342).

[4] Caietani Opusc. Tract. XV. Cap. 2.

[5] Summa Sylvestrina, s. v. *Indulgentia* §§ 21, 24.—Prieriatis Dialogus, Art. 61—"Igitur potestas pontificis per clavem ordinis omnem culpam, et per clavem jurisdictionis, cujus est indulgere, omnem pœnam potest abolere." But he adds (Art. 75) that he disbelieves that the pardoners teach that indulgences release from *culpa*, for it is understood that confession is a pre-requisite.

(From the Original in the White Histo

Leo Bab

Evl vnd Babſtlichen ſegen allen Chriſtg

* . . * *So verleyhen wir auß barmhertzigkeit des al
vñ Pauli/allē vñ yegklichē beyderley geſchlechtes chriſtglawbig
die von dem Sontag des meß eingang anfecht Letare/von der
ſandt Sebalds vnnd des Spitals vorgemelte kirchen zum hey
andern vrſachē verhyndert würdē/durch andere vō yren wegē/a
vñ auffenthaltūg vorgemelter Almuſen/jr hilfflich handreych
meincklich außgibt/In der ſelben kirchen einer/In welcher ſie a
oder die ſo bequemlich/nit ſouil geben mügen/oder das vermüg
legen/Deßgleichen derſelbigen einlegenden vñ handtreichenden
vnderhalten werden/Deßgleichen denen/die an vorgenanten ta
lieb geyſtlich oder leyplich ertzeigen/Jnen dienen/vnd handtrey
laſter vnndverhandlung barmhertzigklich in dem herren/auß v
Bäbſtlichem gewalt/den Regirern vnnd Bröbſten ſandt Seba
werden/oder ſo yr einer nit vorhandē/oder verhyndert were/den
auß einer yegklichen kirchen/oder Cloſter/derſelben Statt/auch
Ordenßlewt/welicherley pettel ordens die ſeind/zu ſetzen/vñ ver
heymſuchen/einlegen/geben oder hilfflich ſeind/vñ peychten wo
vbertrettungē/verſchuldūg/vñ pannen/abſoluirn/vñ fur yr ver
Stull zu Rom vorbehalten ſeind/außgenomen die ſo begriffen
allerley gelübt in die gemelten guten werckh verwandeln mügen
geyſtlicheit. Wir wöllen auch/das diſe genad nit begriffen ſey in
derer genad vnd macht/durch vns/oder den ſtull zu Rom gegeb
des pawes der kirchen/ſandt Peters zu Rom weret/oder Türcke
außgenomen ſey/vñ ſo offt die außgeend/das ſie in jren vorigen
Fabrica der gemelten/vnd anderer kirchen durch vns verlihen/o
werden/Ercleren auch auß vorgemelter macht vnd lawt/das d
des Viſchers Dawmenring/den erſten tag des Monats Octob

LY GHOST AT NÜRNBERG, 1517. (*See page* 76, *Vol. III.*)

ical Library, Cornell University, N. Y.)

ſt der. X.

laꝛvbigen: ſo diſen brieff ſehen werdenn ★ ★

mechtigen gottes vn in vertrawung des gewaltes der Appoſteln ſancti Petri
ẽ mẽſchẽ geyſtlichẽ vñ weltlichẽ/die warlich gepeicht/oð furſatz habẽ zupeichtẽ
ꝛſten Veſper einſchließlich/biß auff den heiligen Oſtertag auch einſchließlich/
ligenn Geyſt/oder der eyne/durch ſich ſelbs/oder wo ſie äuß kranckheit oder
ndechtiglich heymſuchẽ/Vnd zuhandthabũg/erhaltũg/merũg/hinbꝛingũg/
chun. Nemlich ſouil ein yegklichs fur ſich vmb ſpeiß vñ tranckh/einen tag ge-
m liebſten wöllen/geben/vñ einlegen/in den ſtockh/ſo dartzu verordnet wirdet
en/nach jr andacht oder beſcheidenheit/oder aber auß Ratt yrer peichuäter ein
hawßfrawen vñ kinden/die nit eygene gütter haben/vñ durch der ſelbẽ Speiß
gen der Carwochen/den genielten Sunderſiechen die werck der güttigkeit vnd
chung thund/volkumene nachlaſſung vñ genad aller yrer ſund vbertrettung
oꝛgemeltem gewalt in krafft diſer brieff. Wir geben auch mit diſem brieff/auß
ld/vnd ſandt Laurentzen Pfarkirchen/Bröbſten genant/So zu der zeyt ſein
andern Bꝛobſt/doch das der ſelb einen andern Prelatẽ/Rectoꝛ/oder Clericen
von pettel oꝛden zu ſich nem/macht/ettlich peichtveter weltlich prieſter/oder
oꝛdnen/die dy Chriſtglawbigen/ſo die genanten kirchen/wie voꝛ gemelt iſt/
llen/fleiſſigklich peicht hören/Vnd die von allen vñ yegklichen iren ſunden/
handlũg ein heylwertige puß auff ſetzen mogen/yn allen fellen/die auch dem
verden/in der Bulla/ſo man am Grünen dornſtag zuleſen pfligt/das ſie auch
/außgenomẽn Meer/Rom/vnd Jacob fart/auch gelübt der kewſchheit vnd
ynicherley widerrüffung/vnderlaſſung oder außnemũg/dergleichen oder an-
n/in was lawt vnd formẽ/clauſulen vnd decreten das ſey/auch ob die genad
n zug der geweſen were/oder ſein ſolt. Sonder das ſie alwegen von den ſelben
Stand wider eingeſatzt ſey. Vnd dieweil die weren/all ander genad/auch die
der ſo noch gegeben möchten werden/in gemelte Statt nit mogẽ verkündet
iſe genad zu ewigen künfftigen zeyten/weren ſoll. Datum zu Viterb vnder
is. M.D.xvij. Im funfften jar vnnſers Babſtumbs.

phi. de Senis.

Giovanni da Taggia asserts that the popular use of the term is corrupt and abusive, but he proceeds to explain that it may be justified by the contrition and confession requisite to obtain an indulgence.[1] Finally, in 1519, Leo X. was forced to define for the first time the doctrine of the Holy See on the subject, when he could not deny, in the face of the sacramental theory, that the *culpa* is remitted in the sacrament, while the *pœna*, in virtue of the power of the keys, is pardoned by indulgences, through which the treasure is dispensed by the pope, but he took care to claim the papal power over both.[2] It was easy to make an admission of this nature in carefully guarded language which avoided all disclaimer, but it did not alter practice. In the very next year we find Caterino arguing that the remission of *culpa* is through the merits of Christ, and that it is an impious doctrine that the pope in indulgences only remits canonical penance.[3] Berthold of Chiemsee says that *culpa* and *pœna* are remitted by the treasure; œcumenic councils have decided that the jubilee indulgence remits the *culpa* contracted by sin, and he only asserts that the popes confine their indulgences to the contrite and confessed, not that they have not the power to do more.[4] The distinctions on which the theologians relied were too shadowy for the uninstructed mind to grasp, and the popular belief remained unaltered, while the pardoners continued to stimulate the sale of their wares with the same lying

---

[1] Summa Tabiena s. v. *Indulgentia* § 3.

[2] Leonis PP. X. Bull. *Cum postquam* (Le Plat, Monument. Conc. Trident. II. 23). "Romanum pontificem, Petri clavigeri successorem et Jesu Christi in terris vicarium, potestate clavium quarum est aperire tollendo illius in Christi-fidelibus impedimenta, culpam scilicet et pœnam pro actualibus peccatis debitam, culpam quidem mediante sacramento pœnitentiæ, pœnam vero temporalem pro actualibus peccatis secundum divinam justitiam debitam mediante ecclesiastica indulgentia, posse pro rationabilibus causis concedere eisdem Christifidelibus, qui caritate jungente membra sunt Christi, sive in hoc vita sint, sive in purgatorio, indulgentias ex superabundantia meritorum Christi et sanctorum, ac tam pro vivis quam pro defunctis apostolica auctoritate indulgentiam concedendo, thesaurum meritorum Jesu Christi et sanctorum dispensare, per modum absolutionis indulgentiam ipsam conferre, vel per modum suffragii illam transferre consuevisse."

[3] Ambr. Catharini adversus impia ac valde pestifera Martini Lutheri Dogmata Lib. III. fol. 75*b*, Lib. V. fol. 89*b*.

[4] Bertholdi Chiemens. Theologia Germanica Cap. LXXXIX. § 1 (August. Vindel. 1531).

promises as before.[1] The popes persevered in treating indulgences as purely a matter of money unconditioned by repentance or confession. Clement VII., in 1524, when removing the suspension of the cruzada in Spain, recites the bulls of Julius II. and Leo X. as granting *plenissimam indulgentiam* to all who would pay the sum required for the prosecution of the war against the infidel or for the fabric of St. Peter's.[2] Clement, moreover, when prescribing the conditions for his jubilee of 1525, makes no mention of contrition or confession —the only conditions are the customary visits to the churches.[3] It is the same with the plenaries granted by him, in 1530, to members of confraternities formed to aid the Inquisition in extirpating heresy,[4] and a still more cynical disregard even of appearances is manifest in an extension of privileges, in 1565, after the council of Trent, by Pius IV., to the Hospital of St. Lazarus, for he offers a plenary remission and indulgence *a culpa et a pœna*, of all sins to those who at death shall bequeath a legacy to it, without any conditions of contrition or confession. Yet how little he realized the import of the phrase is seen in his conceding a similar indulgence *a culpa et a pœna* to any soul in purgatory for whom the sum fixed by the Hospital shall be paid.[5] Paulianus, in 1549, has no hesitation in saying

[1] Caietano argues (Opusc. Tract. xv. Cap. vii.) that it is not the fault of the Church if the people seek indulgences under a mistaken belief. Juan de Valdés (Diálogo de Mercurio i Caron) introduces a soul complaining that it is sent to hell in spite of having obtained a papal *bula* "en que me absolvia á culpa i á pena in articulo mortis," and Mercury is obliged to explain that the bull was good against purgatory but not against hell. In 1532 María Cazalla, in defending herself before the Inquisition, denied that she had ever said anything against indulgences except that it was an error of the people to suppose that they could enjoy them by paying two reales without contrition or confession (Melgares Marin, Procedimientos de la Inquisicion, II. 126). Berthold of Chiemsee (*ubi sup.*) still complains of the frauds and abuses of the quæstuarii in exaggerating the value of indulgences for gain.

[2] Balan Monumenta Sæc. XVI. Historiam illustrantia I. 30.

[3] Raynaldi Annal. ann. 1525, n. 2. In extending the jubilee throughout Europe, Raynaldus tells us (Ibid. n. 1) that he only prescribed five Paternosters, omitting the customary demand of a part of the expenses of a journey to Rome, in order to avert the attacks of Luther.

[4] Amort, I. 79.

[5] Pii PP. IV. Bull. *Inter assiduas* § 146, 1565 (Bullar. II. 158). In 1567 St. Pius V. cut down the reckless grants of his predecessor, including this provision.—Pii PP. V. Const. *Sicuti bonus*, 1567 (Bullar. II. 219).

that the pope grants salvation by these remissions,[1] and in the reform attempted by the council of Trent, when transferred to Bologna, in 1547, is an admonition to bishops to instruct all preachers to warn the people that the *culpa* is not remitted by indulgences as commonly but falsely asserted by the quæstuarii.[2] It is no wonder that, as Azpilcueta tells us, the fullest indulgences were still popularly known as *a culpa et a pœna*, or that the uneducated failed to grasp his reasoning against those who held that as attrition was converted into contrition by the sacrament, so it could be by indulgences.[3]

To the post-Tridentine theologians indulgences *a pœna et a culpa* have proved a *crux* which they have endeavored to explain variously. Bellarmine repeats the transparent excuse that they were so called because indulgences are ordinarily conjoined with sacramental confession, so that he who is absolved in the sacrament from the *culpa* is absolved from the *pœna* by the indulgence.[4] It is scarce worth while to follow these evasions through the voluminous writings of the moralists, and it will suffice to mention the seven explanations collected by Lavorio. Some, he says, deny that there are such bulls; others assert that it is a mere exaggeration and means only *plenissima;* others attribute it to the pardoners; others argue that the phrase was used to excite the sinner to repentance and lead him to confess; others that it is the style of the curia; others that it refers to the remission of venials, while others more correctly say that *a culpa* is placed in jubilee indulgences in which faculty is granted to choose a confessor who can absolve for reserved cases, and it means the same as a faculty for absolving *a culpa*, and there is added a condition of contrition and confession.[5] This latter explanation might

[1] Pauliani de Jobilæo et Indulgentiis Lib. I. Cap. vi.

[2] Raynald. Annal. ann. 1547, n. 68.

[3] Azpilcueta Comment. de Jobilæo Notab. x. § 18.

[4] Bellarmin. de Indulg. Lib. I. Cap. vii. See Lépicier (Indulgences, their Origin, Nature and Development, London, 1895, p. 56) for a typical illustration of the ease with which the troublesome question can be shuffled off.

[5] Lavorii de Jubilæo et Indulg. P. II. Cap. x. n. 70–75.—Cosimo Montigiani, Trattato de l'Anno del SS. Giubileo, Cap. xviii. (Firenza, 1575).

Whether the *culpa* of venials can be remitted by an indulgence is a disputed question. Bianchi (Foriero dell' Anno Santo, p. 223) says this is the meaning of indulgences *a culpa et a pœna*, but Benedict XIV. (De Synodo Diœces. Lib. XIII. Cap. xviii. § 7) says it is very doubtful whether the *culpa* of venials can be remitted and that the weight of authority is against it. Cf. Serrada, Escudo

serve to becloud the question in the schools, but the plain people were not so taught. In a popular exposition of the jubilee, in 1599, the absolute assertion is made that those who on such occasions devoutly visit the holy places of Rome are completely relieved of both the guilt and punishment of their sins, and this without a word as to contrition and confession.[1]

Apart from these discussions the custom of occasionally issuing indulgences without conditions as to contrition and confession has by no means become obsolete. Thus Clement VIII. and Benedict XIV. granted a plenary together with the liberation of a soul from purgatory for the recitation, before an image of Christ, of a short prayer to Christ crucified, and this without any conditions until, in 1821, Pius VII. renewed it with the condition of confession and communion.[2] Even more significant are the privileges accorded to the Blue Scapular of the Immaculate Conception. Those who wear it and recite six Paters, Aves and Glorias in honor of the Trinity and of the immaculate Virgin, and pray for the needs of the Church, gain every time, without confession and communion, all the plenary and partial indulgences of the seven basilicas of Rome, of Compostella, of the Holy Land and of the Portiuncula.[3] At the solemnities of the canonization of saints it is also customary to bestow a plenary on all those present without conditions.[4]

---

del Carmelo, p. 311; Ferraris Prompta Bibloth. s. v. *Indulgentia* Art. III. n. 20; Bouvier, Traité des Indulgences, pp. 25–6, 62–3. Sincere sorrow for venials is requisite to render the indulgence effective for them.—Raccolta, Ed. 1886, p. xxiv.

[1] Forner, Vom Ablass und Jubeljar, Ingolstatt, 1599, p. 233—"Vonn aller jhrer Sünden Last unnd Straff völligklich entlediget wurden."

[2] Decret. Authent. S. Congr. Indulgent. n. 436.

[3] Decr. Authent. n. 701. The popular manuals of indulgences do not fail to make the most of this special privilege. See P. Blot, Indulgences qu'on peut gagner chez soi, p. 21.—Abbé Cloquet, Les plus faciles Indulgences, p. 30.

[4] "Omnibusque Christifidelibus præsentibus plenariam omnium peccatorum suorum indulgentiam elargitus est."—Bullar. II. 693; III. 43, 134, 266, 291, 468; IV. 16; V. 6; VI. 80, 224, 291, 359 etc.

When, in 1746, Benedict XIV. canonized S. Pedro Regalati the phrase is "concessa omnibus astantibus plenaria peccatorum indulgentia."—Bullar. Contin. Ed. Prati 1846, II. 94.

When, in 1867, Pius IX. canonized S. Josaphat Kuncewicz, Pedro Arbués and a number of others, the form of indulgence published by the senior Cardinal Bishop at command of the pope, was "Sanctissimus in Christo Pater et Dominus

It is no wonder that the theologians continue to ascribe to indulgences, if not the power to wash away the guilt, at least some influence over and above the mere remission of the penalty. When, in the Tuscan movement of the Grand Duke Leopold, Vincenzo Palmieri wrote a book attacking indulgences, he was answered by a zealous ecclesiastic, who admits, indeed, that they cannot remit the *culpa*, but approaches it as nearly as he dares. They remove all obstacles to the true friendship of God, they liberate men from sin, they are the work of the most abundant and majestic Divine mercy, and it is this that leads the devil from time to time to raise up wicked men to oppose them.[1] Bishop Bouvier explains that by exciting to pious works leading to repentance they efface the sin as well as the penalty.[2] Gröne, as we have seen, argues that no one can be safe without them, for what may be lacking in the sacrament is thus made up in grace.[3] The dithyrambic burst of exultation with which the jubilee of the *anno santo* is announced in the papal proclamations can only be justified on the assumption that its indulgence possesses some extraordinary power not shared even by the plenaries, which in modern times are so profusely offered and so easily acquired.[4] That they must have some efficiency irrespective of the mental condition of the recipient would appear when, in 1851, Pius IX. allowed children too young to be admitted to communion to gain those attached to the *Œuvre de la sainte Enfance*, and, in 1851 and 1875, he made the same provision for the plenary indul-

---

Noster, Dominus Pius Divina Providentia Papa Nonus dat et concedit omnibus tam hic præsentibus quam omnibus qui vel Supplicationi vel sacræ actione Canonizationis interfuerant vel hodierna die hanc vaticanam basilicam devote visitabunt Indulgentiam Plenariam.—D. Bartolini Comment. Actorum omnium Canonizationis, Romæ, 1868, II. 328.

This is doubtless considered to be covered by a general rule, as will be seen in the next chapter, conditioning plenaries on confession and communion.

[1] Instruzione per un' Anima fedele sopre le Indulgenze, pp. 3, 6, 72 (Finale, 1787).

[2] Bouvier, Traité des Indulgences, p. 26.

[3] Gröne, Der Ablass, p. 143.

[4] Urbanii PP. VIII. Const. *Omnes Gentes*, 1624 (Bullar. IV. 48).—Leonis PP. XII. Const. *Quod hoc*, 1824 (Bullar. Contin. VIII. 64).

The Franciscans claimed, even in the later seventeenth century, that the Portiuncula indulgence is *a culpa et a pœna*.—Michel' Angelo di Bogliasco, Indulgenza Plenaria detta Portiuncula, p. 45 (Livorno, 1670).

gence of the jubilee, as Pius VI. had already done in that of 1775.[1] Whether or not the insane, who cannot understand what they are or perform the prescribed works, can gain indulgences has never, I believe, been authoritatively settled, but Viva tells us that the weight of opinion is in the affirmative.[2] This would seem to be a natural deduction from the principle that the disposition of the recipient has nothing to do with the effectiveness of the indulgence, his devotion does not enhance it, absence of devotion does not impede it.[3] When thus, in spite of the official disclaimer that indulgences can remit the *culpa*, so much influence is ascribed to them *ex opere operato*, we can scarce be surprised that the old belief still exists among the people that they remove the guilt as well as the penalty. In 1786, Giuseppe Pannilini, the reforming bishop of Chiusi and Pienza instructs his priests to disabuse their flocks of this mistaken confidence,[4] and in a memorial from a number of French bishops to the Vatican council, in 1869, attention is drawn to the equivocal terms sometimes employed in grants of indulgences, whereby the unlearned may be misled as to this point[5]—a warning which could not have been given had not experience demonstrated to the prelates the prevalence of such popular error. Yet the true doctrine is enunciated in Pignatelli's argument that the angels are incapable of benefiting by indulgences, because the good ones do not need them, and the evil ones, being condemned to eternal punishment, cannot avail themselves of that which relieves only from temporal.[6]

[1] Jouhanneaud, Dict. des Indulgences, p. 1243.—Pii PP. IX. Encyc. *Ex aliis* (Acta, Vol. I. p. 349).—Encyc. *Gravibus* (Vol. VI. p. 352).—Pii PP. VI. Const. *Ubi primum* (Bullar. Contin. VI. 8–12). Van Ranst tells us that children too young for communion cannot obtain the jubilee indulgence (Opusc. de Indulg. p. 118).

[2] Viva de Jubilæo et Indulg. p. 98.

A kind of compromise on this point is the assumption that indulgences can be gained and applied to idiots and the insane.—Pignatelli, Il Giubileo dell' Anno Santo, p. 85.

[3] S. Th. Aquin. Summæ Suppl. Q. XXV. Art. ii.—Pasqualigo Theoria et Praxis Jubilæi Q. XXXV. §§ 5, 6.—Viva de Jubilæo ac Indulg. pp. 114–5.—Pignatelli *op. cit.* p. 83.

Of course, as in everything else, there are dissenters from this opinion. See S. Bonavent. in IV. Sentt. Dist. XX. P. ii. Art. 1, Q. 6; Layman Theol. Moral. Lib. V. Tract. VII. Cap. 5, § 2; Beringer, Die Ablässe, p. 65.

[4] Istruzione di Mgr. Vescovo di Chiusi e Pienza, § XXXVII. (Firenze, 1786).

[5] Concil. Collect. Lacensis T. VII. p. 844. [6] Pignatelli, *op. cit.* p. 22.

There is another question of considerable moral significance on which the opinion of the Church has changed for the worse. This is whether the power of the indulgence extends to sins committed in expectation of the remission. The point does not appear to have been raised during the earlier period, but in the fourteenth century there seems to have grown a fashion of including such sins, for occasional grants of indulgence are found in which they are specifically excluded, showing that it was considered an abuse to be repressed. In the formulary of the Avignonese papal chancery there is a formula for special confessional letters containing this clause, and others in which it is omitted; under Eugenius IV. it occurs occasionally in general indulgences; the council of Bâle was careful to insert it in those which it issued, and Julius II. adopted it in one granted, in 1509, for the benefit of Livonia in its struggles with the heretic Russians and infidels.[1] St. Antonino assumes that this is the ordinary form when he says that though a confessor can absolve sacramentally for the *culpa* of such sins, he has no power to do so for the *pœna* under an indulgence, as appears by the indulgence itself, and, in the form which he gives of absolution under indulgences, such sins are specially excepted. Prierias has the same absolution formula, and Stefano Notti says as a general rule that it is commonly accepted that there is no remission through an indulgence for sins committed in expectation of it.[2]

Post-Tridentine theology is much more liberal in this respect. Azpilcueta's argument on the subject is worth summarizing as a candid admission of the demoralizing influence of the whole system, both of penance and indulgences. He urges that the man who sins in the expectation of remission is not more guilty but less, for he who sins without hope of pardon comes near to being a despairing sinner, and is therefore more wicked, while he who sins in the hope of pardon mitigates the gravity of his sin. Besides, the expectation of immunity does not exclude the offender from the benefit of the provisions of the law. This is seen in clerics and others, exempt

[1] Tangl, Die päpstlichen Kanzlei-Ordnungen, pp. 305–7 (Innsbruck, 1894). —Amort de Indulgent. I. 136, 145, 201.—Con. Basiliens. (Harduin. VIII. 1221, 1304).—Diplomata Cullendorfensia n. CLXXXV. (Menken. Scriptt. Rer. German. I. 758).

[2] S. Antonini Summæ P. I. Tit. x. Cap. 3, § 5.—Summa Sylvestrina s. v. *Indulgentia* n. 28.—Steph. ex Nottis Opus Remissionis, fol. 11*b*.

from secular jurisdiction, committing great crimes in the assured confidence of the immunity, complete or partial, conceded to them by the canon *Si quis suadente*, and availing themselves of their privileges for crimes perpetrated after they obtain this immunity, no difference being recognized between those committed with the expectation and those without. This is also seen in religious, who incur censures and irregularities with the hope of absolution and dispensation by virtue of their privileges, and are everywhere absolved. Moreover, all we Christian Catholics commit many sins in hopes of pardon through penance which we would not commit if we believed there was no such remedy, and yet we are not excluded from the benefits of penance, so that to assert otherwise is heretical.[1] Even more significant than this is the line of reasoning adopted by Rodriguez to argue away the clause, still sometimes inserted in indulgences, that they shall not inure to the remission of sins committed in expectation of them. This does not apply, he says, to cases in which the confidence is only a *causa concomitans* and not a *causa positiva*—that is, when it simply strengthens the negligence and indifference leading to sin. He admits that the facility of absolution through the indulgence is kept in mind, and thus the evil thoughts stimulating to sin are not repressed with the care that would be used were it not for the indulgence, but the sinner is not required in his confession to include this confidence, for it is not an aggravating circumstance but rather mitigating, as it proves his trust in the mercy of God. Even when the expectation is a *causa positiva*, Rodriguez proves, by a chain of subtle and tenuous reasoning, that it does not prevent absolution under the indulgence, but he has the grace to add that although this opinion is true it ought not to be publicly taught lest it should stimulate sinners to sin. The only cases in which the precautionary limitation is to be obeyed are coarsely concrete ones, as when a man shall deliberately say, "We will take the indulgence and then kill such a one, for we shall be absolved," or "We have the indulgence through which we shall be absolved, let us commit such and such sins."[2]

When these were the predominant theories among the moralists it can readily be understood that the old-time rigor disappeared and

[1] Azpilcuetæ Comment. de Jobilæo, Notab. XXXIV. § 6.

[2] Rodriguez, Bolla della Crociata, pp. 203–4.

that it came to be generally taught that the expectation of remission was no hindrance to enjoying the benefits of an indulgence. Bellarmine tacitly admits it, and all subsequent authorities which I have consulted unite in the opinion. Pasqualigo even says that this is true when the expectation has led to the commission of the sin — the *causa positiva* of Rodriguez—and that this is not abusing the indulgence any more than sinning in expectation of sacramental absolution is an abuse of the sacrament. The formidable lists of doctors holding these views, adduced by the systematic writers, show that the opinion may be said to be virtually universal.[1] One exception to this, it is true, is to be found in the *crociata* indulgence granted to Naples, in 1778, when the commissioner, in publishing it, warned the people that its benefits were not for those who sinned in expectation of taking it, and Onofri cautioned them not to believe that obtaining it gave them licence to sin and freedom for all the iniquities of their scandalous lives.[2] Recent writers, as a rule, seem to pass the matter over in silence, but Miguel Sanchez assures us that the principle is still observed in practice, that the penalty of sins committed in expectation of an indulgence is remitted by it.[3]

Partial indulgences have sometimes been granted for a fraction of the sins of the penitent—a quarter, or a third, or a half—but the usual designation has always been that of a specified number of days or years, or years and quarantines. When the remission is for a fraction we are told that that portion is remitted in the forum of the Church and of God as fully as if it had been wiped out by penance[4]—and in this shape the matter is plain and easily understood. When, however, it is an enumeration of determinate periods of time there arise

---

[1] Bellarmini de Indulg. Lib. I. cap. x.—Polacchi Comment. in Bull. Urbani VIII. p. 320.—Summa Dianæ s. v. *Bulla Cruciatæ* n. 34.—Lavorii de Jubilæo et Indulg. P. I. Cap. xxi. n. 63.—Pasqualigo Theoria et Praxis Jubilæi Q. 234 n. 3, 5.—Pignatelli, Il Giubileo dell' Anno Santo, p. 391.—Bianchi, Foriero dell' Anno Santo, p. 349.—Viva de Jubilæo ac Indulgentiis, pp. 18, 238.—Benzi Praxis Tribunalis Conscientiæ Disp. I. Q. iii. Art. 2, Par. 3, n. 13.

The chief practical interest in this matter lies in its application to reserved cases, for which absolution can be obtained under jubilee and crusading indulgences.

[2] Onofri, Spiegazione della Bolla della S. Crociata, pp. 128–30; Notizie, p. 90.

[3] Mig. Sanchez Exposit. Bullæ S. Cruciatæ, p. 176.

[4] Summa Sylvestrina s. v. *Indulgentia* § 22.

various intricate questions on which, as no one could know anything positive about them, the theologians of course were at variance. These questions did not arise so long as indulgences were recognized as merely commutations or redemptions of penance and were especially granted as of so much enjoined penance—*de pœnitentiis injunctis*—but when the theory was radically changed by the introduction of the treasure and the remission of the penance that ought to have been enjoined, the formula *de injunctis* naturally disappeared and people began to ask the meaning of the simple forty days or seven years and seven quarantines that they were asked to pay for, while the Holy See, as was its custom, persistently abstained from an authoritative definition.

One question not easily solved was whether the days remitted were calendar days or days of penance—*dies continui* or *dies utiles*. If the penance itself was continuous there was no difference, but if a priest imposed a forty days' fast, three days every week, a forty days' indulgence would exhaust itself in less than seven weeks under one computation, or under the other would extend itself over the whole thirteen weeks. So a year's indulgence might be construed as a year of Friday fastings or as 365 fast days, covering seven years. The doctors mostly held that when the indulgence was only for days it meant *dies utiles*, but when the term was for years it was not so clear—a year *de injunctis pœnitentiis* probably meant a calendar year, but a simple year, without qualification, meant 365 days of penance. The whole subject however was so intricate that Stefano Notti dismisses it with an injunction not to care about it, but to rely on the mercy of God.[1] With the multiplication of plenaries in modern times and the diminution of penance the matter has lost much of its interest, but the citations made by Diana show that in the seventeenth century it was still an object of debate and dissentient opinions.[2]

Indulgences for forty days, to which bishops were for the most part limited were called *quadragenæ* or quarantines, which meant an ordinary Lenten fast; sometimes however they were granted for a

[1] Weigel Claviculæ Indulgentialis Cap. xi.—Summa Angelica s. v. *Indulgentia* § 3.—Summa Sylvestrina s. v. *Indulgentia* § 22.—Steph. ex Nottis Opus Remissionis, fol. 146*b*.

[2] Summa Diana s. v. *Indulgentia* n. 6.

carina, which, as we have seen (II. p. 121), was an infliction of vastly greater severity. As the memory of the old penitential observances faded out there was uncertainty felt as to these distinctions. Bremond prints, from the archives of the Dominican order, a bull of Boniface VIII., in 1295, to aid the rebuilding of the church of St. Mary of Sendomir, which had been burnt by the Tartars in 1260, in which he grants the same indulgence as that of S. Maria ad Martyres of Rome, namely, on its annual feast and during the octave three hundred and sixty years and as many quarantines, which it proceeds to explain by saying that a *carina* means XXX. [evidently XL.] days of purgatory.[1] The bull is a palpable forgery of later date, but this definition of *carina* is interesting as showing either the ignorance of the forgers or their presumption on the ignorance of the people. Modern authors generally understand the difference between *quadragena* and *carina*, but Ferraris says that they are the same.[2] As the customary seven years' penance commenced with a *quadragena* or *carina*, Dr. Weigel tells us that an indulgence of forty days or a *carina* included the seven years, and this has been repeated by modern commentators.[3] Yet this is a self-evident error, for indulgences are very often drawn for seven years and seven quarantines, or any given number of years and as many quarantines, which excludes the idea that a quarantine or *carina* includes seven years of penance. What is the precise significance of this coupling of years and quarantines it is impossible to determine with certainty. Bouvier explains it by saying that in addition to remitting the penalty corresponding to the ordinary canonical penance it adds that of the special penance of the Lents, and Palmieri seems to agree with him.[4] This may be the modern official explanation, but it is evidently incorrect, for the remission of simple years, which is also common, covers the Lents of those years, and

---

[1] Ripoll Bullar. Ord. Prædic. II. 45. Bremond himself expresses doubt as to the genuineness of this document. We shall see hereafter what persistent and audacious forgers were the religious Orders in this matter.

[2] Ferraris Prompta Biblioth. s. v. *Indulgentia* Art. I. § 13.

[3] Weigel Claviculæ Indulgent. Cap. xix.—Polacchi Comment. in Bull. Urbani VIII. pp. 335–6. Bellarmine seems to indicate this without precisely asserting it (De Indulg. Lib. I. Cap. ix.). Gabriel Biel asserts positively that an indulgence of a carina includes forty days and seven years (In IV. Sentt. Dist. XLV. Q. iii. Art. 1).

[4] Bouvier, Traité des Indulgences, p. 27.—Palmieri Tract. de Pœnit. p. 484.

besides, indulgences frequently occur in which the numbers of years and quarantines are not the same.

These are not the only doubtful points connected with indulgences for specified periods. As the conception of commutation of penance became forgotten in the theory of equivalents granted from the merits of Christ and the saints, there evidently arose a popular belief that the remissions were not of days and years of earthly penance but of purgatorial suffering. This is manifested by the insistance with which the theologians continued to point out that no one knows what term in purgatory God may assign to each sin, and that there can be no remission granted save for the earthly penance due to them—that the purgatorial remission is that which corresponds to the penance remitted, but what that may be is known alone to God; besides it is influenced by the degree of ardor and zeal which each penitent would bring to the discharge of his penance if he performed it, and that therefore it is not the same for one man as for another.[1] Weigel, however, tells us that although this is the opinion of the leading doctors, still there are many who do not accept it; moreover, that there is a standing debate as to what will become of indulgences of six thousand years and upwards, because it is universally understood that the world will not last so long, and after the Day of Judgment there will be no use for them—all of which infers that the years are purgatorial and not earthly.[2] Baptista Tornamala illustrates the exceedingly vague and uncertain ideas current by explaining that the remissions of the indulgences are in terms of earth and not of purgatory, and then adding that if a sinner condemned to ten years of purgatory gains a seven years' indulgence he will have only three years to endure.[3] Angiolo di Chivasso rejects as derogatory to indulgences the theory that the release is only of days and years of penance and not of purgatory, while Prierias and Adrian VI. as stoutly affirm the contrary, and intimate that a few days of penance may be equivalent to a longer

[1] P. de Tarentasia in IV. Sentt. Dist. xx. Q. iii. Art. 3; R. de Mediavilla in IV. Sentt. Dist. xx. Art. iii Q. 1 (Amort de Indulg. II. 68, 75).—Guill. Durandi Speculi Lib. iv. Partic. iv. De Pœnit. et Remiss. n. 9.—Jo. Friburgens. Summæ Confessor. Lib. iii. Tit. xxxiv. Q. 181.—P. de Palude in IV. Sentt. Dist. xx. Q. iv. ad 2, Concl. 1.—S. Antonini Summæ P. i. Tit. x. Cap. 3, § 3.

[2] Weigel Clavic. Indulgent. Cap. xi., xxv.

[3] Summa Rosella s. v. *Indulgentia* § 16.

period of purgatory.[1] Bartolommeo Fumo describes the different opinions and does not decide between them, wisely preferring to leave the matter to God.[2]

The council of Trent discreetly avoided settling the question, thus leaving it to be debated by the theologians. Azpilcueta seems to have no doubt that days and years of penance, not purgatory, are meant, and does not even allude to any other theory; he adds that all agree that penance voluntarily endured in life counts for much more than the enforced pains of purgatory, although these are so much more severe.[3] On the other hand, Domingo Soto, while arguing in favor of terms of penance not purgatory, asserts that the latter are so intense that an indulgence of a thousand years will not remit ten of purgatory nor one of seven years a single month.[4] In

[1] Summa Angelica s. v. *Indulgentia* § 2.—Summa Sylvestrina s. v. *Indulgentia* § 8.—Adriani PP. VI. Disput. in IV. Sentt. fol. clxii.

[2] Aurea Armilla s. v. *Indulgentia* § 17.

[3] Azpilcuetæ Comment. de Jobilæo, Notab. XI. § 8, 12, 22; Notab. XXII. § 19.

[4] Dom. Soto in IV. Sentt. Dist. XXI. Q. ii. Art. 1. Cf. Pet. Lombardi Sentt. Lib. IV. Dist. XX. § 1.

Accurate knowledge of purgatory has been had through visions and revelations, by which we are told that its agony is beyond human conception; earthly flames would be refreshing in comparison with the fire which consumes without destroying. Soto (*loc. cit.*) asserts positively that no soul is kept there for twenty or even for ten years, but other authorities differ with him, and he characterizes as utterly false a wholesome popular belief that souls are detained there until all the debts which they may have left behind them are paid (Dist. XLV. Q. ii. Art. 3). San Vincente Ferrer learned that souls have been kept there a year for a single venial sin. Sor Francesca de Pamplona ascertained the fate of several hundred of whom the majority suffered for thirty, forty, or sixty years. A holy bishop for some negligence was detained there fifty-nine years, and a layman the same period for consulting his ease too much, while another for gaming suffered sixty-four years. It was revealed to St. Birgitta that certain souls have to stay there till the Day of Judgment, and Cardinal Bellarmine is of this opinion. It is for this reason that the Church authorizes anniversaries of a hundred years and even perpetual masses for a single soul. —Pieux Commerce des Vivants avec les Morts, pp. 17, 25–6. (The series of which this forms a part—the "*Bibliothèque Catholique de l'Hôpital Militaire de Toulouse*"—was blessed by Pius IX. May 31, 1862, and enjoyed the enthusiastic approbation of Florian, Archbishop of Toulouse.)

So recently as 1859, at the Benedictine Abbey of St. Vincent, near Latrobe, the spirit of a monk appeared and stated that for omitting to celebrate seven obligatory masses it had suffered seventy-seven years in purgatory; every

spite of this Manuel Sa says that both theories as to the meaning of the terms of indulgences are current, and he does not decide between them, while Bellarmine assumes that the question is still open, and without settling it enters into a long disquisition as to whether penance or purgatory is the longer.[1] Diana holds that penance not purgatory is meant, though he admits that there are high authorities of the opposite opinion.[2] Bianchi contradicts himself, for after saying that, if a sinner owes eighty days of purgatory and obtains a hundred-day indulgence, it is a plenary for him, he subsequently asserts that the terms of indulgences are of penance not of purgatory.[3] Ferraris argues that it must be so because there are indulgences of two or three hundred thousand years, and it is not to be supposed that purgatory will last so long.[4] In recent times this opinion seems to have triumphed. The official *Raccolta* explains that by the days and years of an indulgence are remitted so much of the pains of purgatory as would be cancelled by that amount of penance according to the ancient canons, and it has been authoritatively so defined by the English bishops.[5]

---

eleven years it was allowed to visit its brethren and solicit succor, but thus far without success. It prescribed the observances requisite to procure its liberation, and on their performance it disappeared (L'Écho du Purgatoire, Avril, 1879).

That among the people there is belief in purgatorial terms of indefinite length is indicated by the revival of interest in Rome as to the fate of Beatrice Cenci, excited by the recent financial disasters which have so nearly ruined the Borghese family. The sympathy felt for her led to the opinion that she was not consigned to hell but to purgatory; when her estates, confiscated by Clement VIII. were, by the shameless nepotism of Camillo Borghese (Paul V.), made over to his nephews, it was currently said that their enjoyment would last only while she was in purgatory, and the misfortunes of the Borghesi are held to prove that at last her purgation is completed, and that she has been admitted to heaven. At an earlier period the length ascribed to purgatorial torment is illustrated by the story that, in 1199, when the death-bed confession of Richard Cœur de Leon appalled his confessors, he freely offered to remain in purgatory till the Day of Judgment if he could thus appease the justice of God.—Nic. Trivetti Chron. ann. 1199 (D'Achery III. 177).

[1] Em. Sa Aphorismi Confessar. s. v. *Indulgentia* § 8.—Bellarmini de Indulgent. Lib. I. Cap. ix.

[2] Summa Diana s. v. *Indulgentia* n. 5.

[3] Bianchi, Foriero dell' Anno Santo, pp. 221, 223.

[4] Ferraris Prompta Biblioth. s. v. *Indulgentia* Art. I. §§ 13, 14.

[5] Raccolta, p. x.—Green, Indulgences, Sacramental Absolutions, etc., p. 31 (London, 1872).

Somewhat akin to this is the question arising from the existence of indulgences complicated by having remission for days or years superadded to plenary. This is such self-evident surplusage that it has proved troublesome to explain. One suggestion is that when such an indulgence is gained the sinner can enjoy the plenary and apply the partial remission to some one else; others endeavor to find a reason for it by saying that it is a precaution, in case the plenary is invalid for lack of cause, to enable the sinner at least to benefit by the partial.[1]

There was a question which greatly exercised the medieval theologians—the cumulation of partial indulgences. If a man has a seven years' penance enjoined and he visits a church where a one-year indulgence is to be had for a piece of money, can he by successively giving seven coins be liberated wholly from the penance? S. Ramon de Peñafort replies that he does not know nor does he believe that any mortal knows unless it has been divinely revealed to him.[2] This wholesome agnosticism did not suit the temper of the schools, and subsequent doctors had no hesitation in taking sides. Cardinal Henry of Susa, while quoting S. Ramon, confidently affirms that the sinner thus discharges his liability to the Church Militant and is not required to perform any penance.[3] On the other hand, Albertus Magnus treats it as absurd, while Bishop William Durand admits it as unquestionable. The Gloss on the Decretum suggests the compromise that each payment only releases its percentage of what had been left by the preceding, and that if all the money in the world were paid there would still be a fraction unsatisfied.[4]

---

[1] Polacchi Comment. in Bull. Urbani VIII. p. 336.—Ferraris loc. cit. § 16.—Gröne, der Ablass, p. 144.

An example of this is the cruzada indulgence, which, in addition to the plenary, grants fifteen years and fifteen quarantines to those who will pay something more than the fixed price, and also fast on days not of precept and pray for concord and victory over the infidel.—Rodriguez, Bolla della Crociata, p. 74.

In the modern Spanish cruzada this partial indulgence is granted as often as a penitent will fast for a day and pray in church.—Pii PP. IX. Bull. *Dum infidelium* § 4.

[2] S. Raymundi Summæ Lib. III. Tit. xxxiv. § 5.

[3] Hostiens. Aureæ Summæ Lib. v. De Remiss. § 8.

[4] Alb. Magni in IV. Sentt. Dist. xx. Art. 17.—Guill. Durandi Speculi Lib.

Astesanus agrees with Albert, while Bartolommeo di S. Corcordio holds with Cardinal Henry, but advises that the sinner should not use it during life, but reserve it for purgatory, where the punishment will be most severe[1]—a suggestion casting an unpleasant doubt on the efficacy of satisfaction in general. A different phase of the same question was presented by the church of the Holy Sepulchre at Speyer, which exhibited seven indulgences from seven popes, each remitting one-seventh of sins. The doctors were hopelessly divided in estimating their value, some holding that together they amounted to a plenary, others, like the Glossator, that each taken in succession only remitted one-seventh of the balance left by the preceding one. In fact, the whole treatment of the matter, in 1441, by Dr. Weigel, shows how impossible it was to come to any rational common understanding concerning it.[2]

This question however seems to have merged into the larger and more general one — whether an indulgence can be obtained *toties quoties*—as often as the penitent chooses to perform the work enjoined for it. At first there would appear to have been no objection to this, as in a grant by Eugenius III. to the oratory of St. James at Pistoia, in 1145, of seven days' indulgence as often as it should be visited.[3] When an indulgence was so drawn it was generally admitted that it could be gained indefinitely by repetition, and it seems to have been a favorite method by which bishops practically eluded the Lateran canon restricting them to forty days.[4] Yet there was an objection to this, for it was pointed out that all the penitent had to do was to step outside and return as often as he might see fit, which exposed the whole system to derision, and the opinion of Aquinas was largely, though not universally, adopted, that although "perennial" indulgences, such as that of forty days enjoyed by St. Peter's of Rome could be had *toties quoties*, when one was granted for a special feast or for an anniversary and its octave, it could be gained

IV. Partic. iv. De Pœnit. et Remiss. n. 12.—Gloss. in Cap. 23 Decr. Caus. XIII. Q. ii.

[1] Astesani Summæ Lib. v. Tit. xl. Art. 2, Q. 1.—Summa Pisanella s. v. *Indulgentia* § 4.

[2] Weigel Claviculæ Indulgent. Cap. x.

[3] Eugenii PP. III. Epist. XLVII. (Migne, CLXXX. 1063).

[4] Gousset, Actes etc. de Reims, II. 395, 607.—Statut. Synod. Camerac. (Hartzheim IV. 83).—Pez Thesaur. Anecd. VI. III. 15, 259–61, 319.

but once, though Pierre de la Palu would allow it once daily.[1] There were not wanting eminent authorities who held the more liberal view as applying to all indulgences, such as Pierre de Tarantaise, Bishop William Durand, "Archidiaconus" (Giovanni d'Anagni), and it was recognized that the Roman jubilee could be gained as often as the round of visits to the churches was repeated.[2] Yet even as regards the jubilee, practice varied at subsequent periods and the doctors were about equally divided on the question, but, in 1749, Benedict XIV., after an exhaustive examination, decided in favor of *toties quoties*, and this decision was accepted, in 1869, as applicable to the jubilee proclaimed by Pius IX., lasting from June 1st to the opening of the Vatican council, December 3d. As this indulgence could be gained anywhere in the Christian world by two visits to two churches with prayer, fasting for three days, alms to the poor, confession and taking the sacrament, there was ample opportunity for the faithful to gain repeated plenaries.[3]

The same privilege of *toties quoties* was claimed for the cruzada, and indeed for all other plenary indulgences predicated on visiting churches—that they could be gained as often as the visit might be repeated on the same day and the five Paters and Aves be recited—the first plenary being for the benefit of the penitent, while with the rest he might liberate souls from purgatory.[4] This somewhat lax opinion was condemned by the Congregation of Indulgences in 1668,

---

[1] S. Th. Aquin. in IV. Sentt. Dist. xx. Q. iii. ad 4; Summæ Suppl. Q. xxv. Art. ii. ad 4.—Jo. Friburgens. Summæ Confessor. Lib. III. Tit. xxxiv. Q. 183.—Astesani Summæ Lib. v. Tit. xl. Art. 1, Q. 4.—P. de Palude in IV. Sentt. Dist. xx. Q. iv. Art. 1, ad 3, Concl. 3.—Summa Pisanella s. v. *Indulgentia* § 5.—S. Antonini Summæ P. I. Tit. x. Cap. 3, §§ 1, 3.—Summa Rosella s. v. *Indulgentia* § 12.—Summa Angelica s. v. *Indulgentia* § 4.—Summa Sylvestrina s. v. *Indulgentia* § 22.

[2] Guill. Durandi Speculi Lib. IV. Partic. iv. De Pœn. et Remiss. n. 12.—Steph. ex Nottis Opus Remissionis fol. 11*b*, 153*a*, 154*a*, 156*a*.

[3] Viva de Jubilæo ac Indulg. p. 119.—Bianchi, Foriero dell' Anno Santo, p. 355.—Pignatelli, Il Giubileo dell' Anno Santo, p. 395.—Bened. PP. XIV. Const. *Inter præteritas* § 84, 3 Dec. 1749.—Zaccaria dell' Anno Santo, II. 17–20.—Pii PP. IX. Const. *Nemo certe* 11 Apr. 1868 (Collect. Lacens. VII. 10–12, 1072).

The three days' fast in this latter indulgence gave rise to twelve doubtful questions which the Congregation of Indulgences had to settle.

[4] Rodriguez, Bolla della S. Crociata, pp. 104, 106.—Summa Diana s. v. *Bulla Cruciatæ* n. 11.

but when, in 1718, it was asked whether, when the brief of concession read "as often as they may visit the church" or "toties quoties," repeated plenaries could be gained the same day, it declined to answer, and left the question to be solved by the faithful at their peril.[1] Yet it admitted the principle as regards the Portiuncula indulgence which is obtainable in all Franciscan churches from first vespers of August 1st to midnight of August 2. The Congregation of the council of Trent rendered decisions to this effect in 1720 and 1723, and when, in 1847, the Congregation of Indulgences was asked whether this indulgence can be gained as often as one enters the church and prays a little, and whether communion is also necessary, it replied affirmatively to the first question and negatively to the second.[2] As regards other indulgences, the refusal of a decision, in 1718, left the matter open, and Ferraris recurs to the opinion of Aquinas, that when the indulgence is perpetual and indeterminate it can be gained as often as the prescribed work of visiting a church is performed; when it is limited to a certain day, it can be had but once.[3] When this came to be applied to plenaries, there arose the difficulty that Innocent XI. (1676–1689) had decided that more than one plenary cannot be gained in a single day, but this was reversed, in 1841, by the Congregation of Indulgences, which decreed in favor of as many repetitions as the penitent may desire, even when communion is prescribed as a condition.[4] In the popular desire to acquire them with the least possible trouble there arose a belief that it is not even necessary to leave the church and re-enter it, but that it suffices to separate the several pardons by some act, such as the sign of the cross or moving to another spot. In

[1] Decreta Authentica n. 4, 39.

[2] Raccolta di Indulgenze, Camerino, 1803, pp. 165–7.—Decreta Authentica n. 620.

[3] Ferraris Prompta Biblioth. s. v. *Indulgentia* Art. III. n. 26–7.

[4] Viva de Jubilæo ac Indulg. p. 120.—Decr. Authent. n. 534.

Before this relaxation Bianchi, in 1700, explained (Foriero dell' Anno Santo, p. 356) how a man could gain two plenaries on the same day, for if he is a member of a confraternity which has the indulgence of the Seven Churches for visiting a certain altar, and if on the same day he visits that altar and also the Seven Churches, he gains two plenaries. This is quite moderate, however, for Miguel Medina (Disputat. de Indulg. Cap. XLVIII.) praises the magnificent liberality of the Church through which, by holy avarice, a man can gain thirty or more indulgences a day.

the case, however, of the "Pardon of St. Francis de Paula"—a *toties quoties* plenary granted to the churches of the Minims, in 1579, by Gregory XIII.—the Congregation, in 1882, decided that leaving and re-entering the church is requisite.[1] Such *toties quoties* plenaries are not common, but we will meet with occasional instances of them, and, as recently as 1892, Leo XIII. granted one to all Carmelite churches for July 16th, the feast of Our Lady of Carmel.[2]

---

[1] Sacr. Congr. Indulg. de Indulgentia *toties quoties* Ecclesiar. Ord. Minim. Romæ, 1882.

[2] Leonis PP. XIII. Litt. Apost. *Quo magis*, 16 Maii, 1892 (Acta, XII. 129).

CHAPTER II.

REQUISITES FOR INDULGENCES.

As a matter of course, for an indulgence to be valid and to be validly acquired, certain conditions are recognized as essential. To the validity of the indulgence the first requisite is the jurisdiction of the grantor—that of the bishop in his diocese, of the archbishop in his province, and of the pope over all the faithful, the two former being still subject to the limitations imposed upon them by the Lateran council in 1216. Besides this the theologians tell us that the object or cause for which the indulgence is granted must be sufficient to justify such an application of the treasure, and, moreover, that the works enjoined to gain it are adequate.

As regards sufficiency of cause there has been an endless amount of discussion. Alexander Hales asserts that for plenaries great cause is required, to which his disciple, Bonaventura, assents by saying that to avoid simony the treasure is to be distributed only for the honor of God and benefit of the Church, and that there must be a reasonable cause, for it is inconceivable that indulgences would be efficient if offered to those going to witness a tournament.[1] Albertus Magnus is emphatic in the assertion that sufficient cause is requisite, such as danger to the faith, the recovery of the Holy Land, the poverty of the church to be benefited, etc., but his disciple Aquinas argues that their real cause is the superabundant merits of the Church, and there is no necessary proportion between the grant and the object, though there must be a cause pertinent to the honor of God or the advantage of the Church.[2] Pierre de la Palu insists that due cause is requisite, and that an indulgence granted by the pope *proprio motu* and without motive is invalid.[3] Clement VI. in

[1] Alex. de Ales Summæ P. IV. Q. XXIII. Membr. 6.—S. Bonavent. in IV. Sentt. Dist. XX. P. ii. Art. 1, Q. 4, 6.

[2] Alberti Magni in IV. Sentt. Dist. XX. Art. 17.—S. Th. Aquin. in IV. Sentt. Dist XX. Q. iii.; Quodl. II. Art. xvi.

[3] P. de Palude in IV. Sentt. Dist. XX. Q. iv.

his jubilee bull says that the treasure is intrusted to the pope to be dispensed for proper and reasonable cause.[1] St. Antonino holds that he who grants an indulgence without due cause sins as a dilapidator of the treasure, but yet it is valid to him who earns it and piously trusts in its efficacy.[2] Dr. Weigel quotes a number of authorities to prove that indulgences are valueless when granted recklessly and arbitrarily, and cites Henry of Hesse to the effect that many persons who gain plenaries will find themselves in hell when they expect to enter heaven without passing through purgatory.[3] He also devotes a long argument to prove that issuing indulgences for money is not simony. This was a point which naturally troubled the pre-Reformation doctors not a little. The conceptions of the period were so grossly material, and indulgences were used almost so exclusively as a financial expedient, that it was scarce thought that they could be employed for any other purpose. It is true that it was specified that the object, although temporal, must be intended for spiritual ends—the celebrated *temporalia ordinata ad spiritualia* which served to cover so much of the ecclesiastical extension of power and function—but that indulgences could be used for purely spiritual purposes was rather grudgingly admitted, and the only instance cited to support it was one of ten days granted by Innocent IV. to those who would pray for Louis IX. of France while he was a prisoner of the infidel in Egypt.[4]

The rigid Caietano insists that indulgences granted without reasonable cause are invalid, and in such matters the pope may easily err—but then it is to be presumed that there is reasonable cause unless there is manifest error. The pope is not the master of the treasure but merely the dispenser, and through human fallibility he may err in this, as in canonizing a saint who in reality is damned, but the Church presumes the saint to be rightly canonized and the indulgence to be rightly issued. The manner in which Caietano recurs to the subject, and his labored attempts to solve what he calls a most difficult question, show the perplexity which conscientious men felt

---

[1] Extrav. Commun. Cap. 2, Lib. v. Tit. ix.

[2] S. Antonini Summæ P. I. Tit. x. Cap. 3, § 1.

[3] Weigel Claviculæ Indulgent. Cap. xvii.

[4] Weigel op. cit. Cap. xxx.—Alex. de Ales Summæ P. IV. Q. XXIII. Membr. 4, 8.—S. Th. Aquin. Summæ Suppl. Q. XXV. Art. iii.—Astesani Summæ Lib. v. Tit. xl. Art. 4, Q. 1, 2.—Summa Angelica s. v. *Indulgentia* § 14.

in reconciling theory with fact, and the only conclusion he can reach is that if an indulgence is too great for its cause it is invalid as far as regards the excess—a very unsatisfactory result, for it leaves in doubt the validity of all such remissions; yet in this Adrian VI. agrees with him.[1] Prierias is troubled by no such scruples; he follows Aquinas and declares that anything conducive to the honor of God or the utility of the Church or of the neighbor is sufficient, for *tantum valent quantum sonant*[2]—a definition by the courtly Master of the Palace sufficiently elastic to cover the acts of his master, Leo X., who, when he granted a church to one of his favorites, would follow it with an indulgence to all who would offer oblations there, manifestly to the advantage of the revenues of the beneficiary.[3] When such prostitution of the power of the keys led to revolt, and Luther complained that indulgences were granted for trivial and insufficient objects, Caterino could only reply that this was not a subject for wise men to discuss; they might discuss what ought to be, but not what is. That is the business of the pope, who is bound to answer to God but not to man.[4] Similarly soon afterwards Pauliano argues that whatever the pope confirms or pardons it is to be believed that he does it by the will and command of God.[5]

The council of Trent was wise in not attempting a definition of so delicate a matter; its warning to be moderate in the granting of indulgences was unheeded[6] and the discussion between the theologians continued. Domingo Soto insists on reasonable cause. Dissipation of the treasure of the Church is not dispensation but dilapidation; whether indiscreet indulgences are valid is disputed among the doctors, and he inclines to the negative.[7] Rodriguez is more cautious: he admits the general opinion to be that an indulgence without cause is worthless, but he shows that this is merely an academical question when he says that it is not a subject to be discussed in the vernacular, and warns the reader that if the cause

[1] Caietani Opusc. Tract. IX. Q. 1, 2; Tract. XV. De Indulg. Cap. iv. viii.—Adriani PP. VI. Disput. in IV. Sentt. fol. clx–clxi.

[2] Summa Sylvestrina s. v. *Indulgentia* § 7.

[3] Hergenröther Regest. Leon. PP. X. n. 11268–9, 11510–11.

[4] Ambr. Catharini adv. M. Lutheri Dogmata Lib. v. fol. 88*a*.

[5] Pauliani de Jobilæo et Indulgentiis p. 88 (Romæ, 1550).

[6] C. Trident. Sess. XXV. Contin. Decr. de Indulg.

[7] D. Soto in IV. Sentt. Dist. XXI. Q. ii. Art. 2.

appears insufficient it is great temerity and worthy of severe chastisement to call in question the judgment of the pope, who knows his own motives and communicates often with God about them.[1] Henriquez puts forward the comforting suggestion that when there is insufficiency of cause, God makes it up, but Bellarmine denies this.[2] Manuel Sa tells us that great names are ranged on either side of the question, but he does not consider that there can be any doubt in so far as papal indulgences are concerned.[3] Willem van Est says that any excess of an indulgence over its cause is invalid and inoperative, but this it is impossible to determine, and it must be left to the judgment of the prelates.[4] Tomás Sanchez assumes that any lack of proportionate cause makes indulgences wholly or partially invalid, and as this has to be measured by human judgment they are very uncertain.[5] Polacchi admits that insufficient cause invalidates an indulgence to the extent of its insufficiency, but nevertheless it releases the conscience of the sinner, for he necessarily must presume it to be valid. The pope ought always to be supported, and no matter how gross may be the error in conceding an indulgence for private interest it ought not to be publicly condemned, for this is to give aid and comfort to the heretics.[6] Lavorio states that the pope is not the master but the servant and dispenser, but the cause must always be presumed to be sufficient, as otherwise there would be no certainty in indulgences.[7] Diana insists that the indulgence must be proportioned to the cause.[8] Viva argues that the popes usually have the advice of learned theologians not readily deceived, but he cannot gainsay the triviality of the objects of many indulgences, and he advises the sinner to seek those which seem to have an adequate cause.[9] Bianchi urges that it is not for individuals to inquire whether the motive of an indulgence is sufficient; the success of a Christian prince well affected to the Church over another not so well

---

[1] Rodriguez, Bolla della Crociata, pp. 17–18.

[2] Henriquez Summæ Theol. Moral. Lib. VI. Cap. xiv. § 2.—Bellarmini de Indulgent. Lib. I. Cap. xii.

[3] Em. Sa Aphor. Confessor. s. v. *Indulgentia* § 1.

[4] Estii in IV. Sentt. Dist. XX. § 10.

[5] Th. Sanchez in Præcepta Decalogi Lib. V. Cap. 5, n. 6.

[6] Polacchi Comment. in Bull. Urbani VIII. pp. 337–42.

[7] Lavorii de Indulg. P. II. Cap. xii. n. 30–32.

[8] Summa Diana s. v. *Indulgentia* n. 3.

[9] Viva de Jubilæo ac Indulg. pp. 91–5.

affected suffices; so is the granting of an indulgence in order not to disgust the applicant by refusal, and if an indulgence is asked for on purely selfish motives of temporal benefit it is good, provided a sufficient cause is alleged in the grant; even deceit in alleging false motives for obtaining them does not invalidate them.[1]

The rigorist school naturally was more exacting. Van Ranst asserts that the popes cannot squander the treasure arbitrarily, for God will not ratify such acts, and he assumes the test to be that the object must be more pleasing to God than the satisfaction remitted.[2] Even Ferraris admits that a papal indulgence may be invalid for lack of sufficient motive, wherefore it is prudent, in the case of the dead, to supplement it with masses on a privileged altar.[3] Padre Feyjoo argues that no one can be certain of the sufficiency of the papal motives, for this is not a question of faith or morals, but only of fallible human sagacity.[4] Giunchi meets the objection that all indulgences are thus rendered doubtful by pointing out that this should only render the sinner who gains them more anxious to placate God by meet fruits of repentance[5]—apparently not recognizing that this is admission that indulgences had better be dispensed with altogether. On the other hand, the laxists sought to do away with all doubt. Andreucci asserts that the pope is sole master of the treasure; he can do with it as he pleases, and requires no cause to justify his acts.[6] Liguori does not go quite so far as this, but merely says that it is no business of the individual to enquire into the sufficiency of the cause, and another upholder of the papacy assures us that it is a scandalous impertinence to seek to scrutinize the mind of the pope.[7] Whether impertinent or not, it would be curious to trace the process of reasoning which, in 1846, led Pius IX. to grant the request of the General of the Theatines that the altars of St. Andrea Avellino, the protector against apoplexy, be privileged, even when there is

[1] Bianchi, Foriero dell' Anno Santo, pp. 287–90.—Potiti de Joriis Tract. de Suffragiis, Indulgentiis etc. p. 64 (Romæ, 1691).

[2] Van Ranst Opusc. de Indulgent. pp. 62–3.

[3] Ferraris Prompta Biblioth. s. v. *Indulgent*, Art. II. n. 33–4; Art. III. n. 19.

[4] Feyjoo, Cartas Tom. I. n. 45.

[5] Giunchi de Indulgentiis, pp. 62–66.

[6] Andreucci de Requisitis ad lucrandas Indulgentias, pp. xxxiv.–xliii.

[7] S. Alph. de Ligorio Theol. Moral, Lib. v. n. 532.—Instruzione per un' Anima fedele, p. 108.

another privileged altar in the same church, the reason alleged being that a number of sudden deaths had recently occurred in Theatine churches.[1] Bouvier agrees with Liguori that the sufficiency of the cause is not to be inquired into, but he admits that a plenary indulgence may thus be reduced to a partial, though the applicant gets all that it is worth, and if it is absolutely invalid for lack of cause he can console himself with the fact that the accompanying advantages of absolution for reserved cases, dispensation for irregularities and commutation of vows are not lost.[2] Palmieri, while admitting that the cause must be sufficient, adopts the view of Aquinas that the cause of remission is the authority of the grantor, and that of Liguori that, unless the lack of cause is manifest, the individual must leave the matter to the judgment of the prelates.[3] Thus the eternal debate goes on, with no more prospect of a settlement than there was six hundred years ago.

The question as to the proportion which the work enjoined should bear to the indulgence is one on which there has been as little unanimity as on most other subjects. As a matter of course, from the beginning it was less than the penance for which it was a substitute, else there would have been nothing in indulgences to attract sinners—or, as Alexander Hales puts it, there would be no mercy or grace, and he argues that in this there is no injustice, for indulgences come from God, and whatever God does is just.[4] Yet it would seem natural that in dispensing the treasure a fair equivalent should be demanded in proportion to the grace bestowed. This, however, was by no means easy in practice, nor did it always accord with the policy of the Holy See, for in the Albigensian wars forty days' service in Languedoc acquired the same plenary as a year spent in the far more costly and perilous crusade to Palestine. Even more marked was this inequality in the indulgences bestowed for visiting churches. As the schoolmen remark, in such cases the priest of the church, or the parishioner living next door, gains as much as he who performs a pilgrimage of a thousand days' journey—though the latter acquires

---

[1] Decret. Authent. S. Cong. Indulg. n. 602.

[2] Bouvier, Traité des Indulgences, pp. 31, 51.—Potiti de Joriis Tract. de Suffragiis etc. p. 65.

[3] Palmieri Tract. de Pœnit. pp. 449–50, 475.

[4] Alex. de Ales Summæ P. IV. Q. XXIII Membr. vii.

more merit—and from this it was a natural deduction that the work enjoined need not be proportioned to the reward promised, which was no more unjust than the fact that the life-long sinner with a thousand crimes obtained the same pardon as one whose conscience was burdened with scarcely one.[1] Occasionally some effort was made to adjust this inequality by proportioning the reward to the work. In an indulgence of the twelfth century enjoyed by the church of St. Sebastian at Rome, it is said to be one year for Romans and those of the vicinage, two years for the rest of Italy and three years for pilgrims from beyond seas, and Aquinas tells us that the popes sometimes adopted a similar scale.[2] So when Boniface VIII. inaugurated the jubilee he required Romans to visit the churches of St. Peter and St. Paul for thirty days, while fifteen sufficed for strangers;[3] and when Benedict XIII. granted a plenary for a pilgrimage to the church of S. Maria de Cella in Syria, and the question arose whether it could be gained by the inhabitants of the place, the Congregation of Indulgences, in 1753, decided in the negative, though it neglected to specify the exact distance required.[4]

A more burning question speedily arose from the innumerable indulgences granted *manus porrigentibus adjutrices* to churches—for the benefit of those who would stretch forth a helping hand. As no definite payment was specified it was left to the conscience of the sinner, and the custodians of the churches doubtless were frequently aggravated by men of rank and wealth who would claim the pardon for the same trifling oblation which secured it for the peasant. At an early period therefore there was an effort to establish a rule that the offering must be proportionate to the wealth of the applicant. Peter of Poitiers enunciates this, arguing that the widow's mite shows that God looks to the good-will of the giver, and a rich man's parsimony does not evince good will.[5] The rule did not establish itself immediately, for the most that William of Rennes can say is

---

[1] S. Th. Aquin. Summæ Suppl. Q. xxv. Art. ii. ad 4; In IV. Sentt. Dist. xx. Q. iii.—Astesani Summæ Lib. vi. Tit. xl. Art. 2, Q. 2.—Weigel Claviculæ Indulgent. Cap. xi., xxx.

[2] Papebrochii Catal. Pontif. Diss. xiii. § 8.—S. Th. Aquin. Summæ Suppl. Q. xxv. Art. ii. ad. 4.

[3] Extrav. Commun. Cap. 1, Lib. v. Tit. ix.

[4] Decret. Authent. n. 217.

[5] Pet. Pictaviens. Sentt. Lib. iii. Cap. xvi.

that it is an opinion held by some and that it is probable.[1] Aquinas however asserts it positively; a poor man giving a penny may gain it wholly, while a rich man who does not give according to his means only obtains it proportionally—a proposition too favorable to the churches not to find followers, though many high authorities denied it.[2] Boniface VIII. put the matter in a practical business shape when, in an indulgence granted, in 1299, to the Domus Dei Hospital of Viterbo, he promised remissions in proportion to the amount of the payment and the zeal of devotion.[3] The conclusion seems to have been reached that the matter depends on the terms of the bull conceding the indulgence, which leads Gerson to complain that the rich man has an advantage over the beggar and the monk, but Adrian VI. declares positively that he who does not give what comports with his station and means only gains the indulgence proportionately.[4] Domingo Soto states that formerly payments proportioned to wealth were required, but now all pay the same;[5] in this he alludes to the cruzada, not foreseeing that soon afterwards there would be a classification introduced placing the indulgence at different prices according to station. With the reforms of St. Pius V. forbidding "eleemosynary" indulgences the question lost much of its importance, but still Sixtus V. in proclaiming his jubilee of 1588 required the rich to pay more for it than the poor.[6] In the next century, however, Rodriguez and Willem van Est assert that the "alms" must be proportionate to the means of the sinner, while Diana argues that when "alms" are prescribed without defining the amount, he who gives one piece of money earns the indulgence as effectually as he who gives a hundred, and even when ability is specified as the measure some authorities hold that it makes no difference, for otherwise no one could feel safe that he gained it.[7]

---

[1] Guill. Redonens. Postill. super Raymundi Summam Lib. III. Tit. xxxiv. § 5.

[2] S. Th. Aquin. Summæ Suppl. Q. xxv. Art. 2 ad 3.—Durand. de S. Porciano in IV. Sentt. Dist. xx. Q. iv. §§ 13, 14.—Astesani Summæ Lib. v. Tit. xl. Art. 2, Q. 1.

[3] Digard, Registres de Boniface VIII. n. 2975.

[4] Weigel Claviculæ Indulgent. Cap. xxx.—Summa Angelica s. v. *Indulgentia* § 2.—Jo. Gersonis Regulæ Morales, xxv. G. (Ed. 1488).—Adriani PP. VI. Disput. in IV. Sentt. fol. clxv. col. 1.

[5] Dom. Soto in IV. Sentt. Dist. xxi. Q. ii. Art. 2.

[6] Rodriguez, Bolla della Santa Crociata, p. 18.

[7] Rodriguez, *op. cit.* p. 79.—Estii in IV. Sentt. Dist. xx. § 10.—Summa Diana s. v. *Indulgentiæ requisita* n. 5, 7.

As regards the pious works in general required for the acquisition of indulgences, opinions have been by no means unanimous. Durand de S. Pourçain says that as the pope frequently grants them without prescribing anything to be given or done, it appears that no such condition is indispensable.[1] Adrian VI. insisted that they should bear some proportion to the extent of the pardon offered—to grant a plenary for a styver or half a styver would be squandering the treasure, and the contributor would get only what was proportioned to his gift.[2] Domingo Soto argues in the same sense; to grant a plenary for the recitation of an *Ave or a Pater* is evidently out of all due proportion.[3] On the other hand, Miguel Medina presents the unanswerable reasoning that if proportionate cause were required, not only the bulls containing three hundred plenaries sold for two pieces of silver, and the confessional letters and bulls which fetched two pence would be mere papal deceits, but all indulgences would be subject to the same condemnation.[4] In the same spirit Polacchi declares that the pope can grant what indulgences he pleases without requiring the performance of any pious works, and he gives as examples the plenaries which accompany the papal benediction at Easter, Ascension, and other solemnities; bishops, in fact, grant their allotted forty days when blessing all who are present.[5] This argument would seem to be conclusive, and Viva accepts it, drawing the inference that the result is the same whether the labor is much or little, whether the pilgrim to gain a jubilee has a longer or shorter journey or visits the churches oftener—which shows how far the Church had travelled since the days of Boniface VIII. Moreover, if the cause for granting an indulgence is insufficient, it cannot be made good by increase in the pious works.[6] On the other hand, van Ranst holds that the work enjoined must bear some proportion to the indulgence,[7] while again Andreucci considers that

[1] Dur. de S. Porciano in IV. Sentt. Dist. XX. Q. iv. § 10.

[2] Adriani PP. VI. in IV. Sentt. fol. clxi.

[3] Dom. Soto in IV. Sentt. Dist. XXI. Q. ii. Art. 3.

[4] Mich. Medinæ Disput. de Indulgent. Cap. XLVIII.

[5] Polacchi Comment. in Bull. Urbani VIII. pp. 125, 343.

[6] Viva de Jubilæo et Indulgent. pp. 81–2, 116–7. Viva endeavors to reconcile this with the promises of Boniface by suggesting that extra zeal may obtain the remission of punishment due to venial sins not remitted.

[7] Van Ranst Opusc. de Indulg. p. 63.

works are superfluous, and it is only an accident if the grantor requires them.[1] Dr. Amort indignantly asks whether the lavish bestowal of plenary indulgences for carrying blessed medals or reciting a Paternoster can be deemed a satisfactory equivalent for innumerable sins, and he adds that in this case the heretics are justified in their ridicule.[2] In the lavish bestowal of indulgences in modern times for the simplest observances one would think that the question had lost all practical interest, yet Gröne still tells us that indulgences can only be granted for works pious, reasonable and corresponding to the magnitude of the remission.[3] Palmieri is much more candidly in line with modern practice when he says that it is a common prejudice to believe that the remission only corresponds with the works enjoined to gain it, though he elsewhere argues that a greater indulgence requires a greater cause, that is, a more perfect work.[4] To some extent this is recognized in the numerous indulgences of one hundred or three hundred days for the recitation of a prayer, with a plenary if it is repeated daily for a month.

Another condition for the enjoyment of an indulgence appears to have existed in the early period, when it was admitted that the jurisdiction of the priest over his flock was so exclusive that it could not be interfered with except with his consent. Astesanus alludes to this when he quotes from Cardinal Henry of Susa a recommendation that the confessor should add to his absolution a clause enabling the penitent wherever he should go to avail himself of the remissions of prelates that otherwise he could not enjoy[5]—a desirable concession to one about to make a pilgrimage to some shrine where indulgences were to be had. While, on the one hand, this control of the confessor over his penitent might seem antagonistic to the papal supremacy in the matter of indulgences, on the other hand it served a purpose in furnishing an additional incentive to purchasers to confess to the priests who formed the retinue of the peripatetic *quæstuarii*, but the centralizing tendencies of the period were adverse to such claims. In the middle of the fifteenth century Cardinal Nicolò Tedeschi denies them; soon afterwards Baptista Tornamala says that is a

---

[1] Andreucci de Requisitis ad lucrandas Indulgentias, pp. xiii.–xviii.

[2] Amort de Indulgent. II. 224.

[3] Gröne, Der Ablass, p. 134.

[4] Palmieri Tract. de Pœnit. pp. 450, 475–6.

[5] Astesani Summæ Lib. v. Tit. xxxi. Q. 2.

matter of counsel, not of necessity, and at the commencement of the sixteenth Stefano Notti, while in one passage he admits that the confessor when imposing penance can determine whether or not it may be redeemed with an indulgence, in another argues against it as irreconcilable with papal control over the treasure which is the common property of the Church. At the same time he concedes that it is wise to obtain the licence of the confessor to gain indulgences.[1] Soon after this Prierias, while mentioning the opinion of some authorities that the consent of the confessor is requisite, dismisses it as belittling unduly the power of indulgences,[2] and from the absence of allusion to the matter in later writers, I presume that the claim was rapidly becoming obsolete. A Spanish *Confessionario* of the early sixteenth century, however, presents a variant of the same principle in assuming that the intention of the confessor is requisite to the due application of the indulgence after it has been gained.[3]

Of the conditions requisite on the part of the grantee to obtain the benefit of an indulgence the first is that he should be in a state of grace. We have seen above, when discussing indulgences *a pœna et a culpa*, that there has always been a strong tendency to regard them as efficient to remit the sin as well as the penalty, but in theory at least the Church has consistently held that they are good only as against the temporal punishment after the *culpa* has been removed by the sacrament, and that consequently their full benefit can only be enjoyed by him who is free from mortal sin and in a state of charity or grace. This serves to explain the somewhat indiscriminate distribution of unconditioned indulgences at papal benedictions, the canonization of saints and the like. Whatever the recipients might believe, the grantor can comfort himself with the conviction that the pardon is inoperative with those who are not fitted to enjoy it. Yet in this there have been the customary differences of opinion and construction among theologians.

Even before the theory of indulgences was worked out, Alain de

[1] Steph. ex Nottis Opus Remissionis fol. 146*a*, 147*b*, 148*a*, 149–50.—Summa Rosella s. v. *Indulgentia* § 15.

[2] Summa Sylvestrina s. v. *Indulgentia* §§ 23.

[3] Confessionario breve y muy provechoso (*sine nota*).

Lille declared that those who were not in charity gained nothing from them.[1] Albertus Magnus approximates somewhat to the conception of remission of *culpa* when he explains that they are of double service to one in mortal sin, for the good works performed make him approach the state of grace, and the Church with its treasure renders him worthy of conversion.[2] Aquinas denies this; indulgences always specify that they are granted to those truly contrite and confessed, and they alone derive benefit from them, and this became the ruling doctrine of the schools, though Adrian VI. recurs to the theory of Albertus Magnus.[3] This is simple enough, but in practice a good many subsidiary questions arose, not always easy of solution. François de Mairone, for instance, tells us that if, after confession and absolution, a man falls into mortal sin before he can procure the indulgence it is good for the *pœna* of the sins absolved, but not for the last unabsolved one.[4] Caietano points out that there are two kinds of indulgences—one in which it is simultaneous with the work prescribed, as for visiting a church; the other for future work, as in assuming the cross; in the former there can be no doubt that the state of grace is requisite at the time, in the latter opinions are divided. Also, when the pope, as is customary, grants five years' indulgence to those present in his chapel when he celebrates mass during Advent and Lent, is the sinner required to be contrite at the time, or can he reserve his contrition and subsequently, on experiencing it, enjoy the remission?[5] Domingo Soto says that if a man pays for the cruzada indulgence while in mortal sin, and subsequently confesses and is absolved, he is released indeed from the *culpa*, but does not enjoy remission of the *pœna;* nor, if the prescribed work is prayer, does it avail him—though Soto admits that the opposite opinion does not lack probability.[6] Rodriguez insists that the rigid application of the rule throws a doubt over all indulgences, for no man can know whether he is in a state of grace or not, where-

[1] Alani de Insulis contra Hæreticos Lib. II. Cap. xi.

[2] Alberti Mag. in IV. Sentt. Dist. XX. Art. 18.

[3] S. Th. Aquin. Summæ Suppl. Q. XXVII. Art. 1 ad 1.—Jo. Friburgens. Summæ Confessor. Lib. III. Tit. xxxiv. Q. 180, 186.—Adriani PP. VI. Disput. in IV. Sentt. fol. clxii.

[4] F. de Mayronis in IV. Sentt. Dist. XIX. Q. ii. Art. 2.

[5] Caietani Opusc. Tract. X. Q. 2; Tract. XV. De Indulg. Cap. 4.

[6] Dom. Soto in IV. Sentt. Dist. XXI. Q. ii. Art. 3.

fore it suffices for him to intend to be in a state of grace.[1] Lavorio contests the opinion of those who hold that the state of grace is unnecessary; good works, he says, in mortal sin will win many temporal benefits—health, wealth, honor and power, but not this.[2] Jacopo Graffi asserts that the works prescribed can be performed in mortal sin, and subsequently the penitent can confess and take communion, when the indulgence will become operative,[3] but this is denied by some and doubted by others; Viva explains that the pope could grant an indulgence which would thus be operative, but that in fact he never does.[4]

Bellarmine solves the questions raised by Caietano by drawing distinctions. When the indulgence is granted to take effect at the moment, as in papal benedictions, it is only good to those in a state of grace at the time; when it is for the purpose of placating God, all the works enjoined must be performed in a state of grace, for God is not placated by dead works; when it is for the purpose of a crusade or for building a church, relieving the poor etc. it suffices if the last of the works is performed in a state of grace.[5] This question as to the condition of the penitent while engaged in the pious works prescribed to earn the pardon is one which has long been debated. St. Antonino admits that it is desirable that all the works should be performed in grace, but this is only essential at the conclusion of the last one when the indulgence is earned.[6] This was reducing the requirement of absence of *culpa* to the lowest denomination, and was very generally rejected by the theologians of the period. Weigel says that a man must confess and accept penance and then remain in a state of grace until he has completed the works and gained the indulgence.[7] Caietano asserts that the works must be performed in

[1] Rodriguez, Bolla della Crociata, p. 28.

[2] Lavorii de Indulgent. P. II. Cap. xiv. n. 57–66.

[3] Jac. a Graffiis Aurear. Decis. Append. Lib. II. Cap. 5, n. 40.—Prierias had already asserted this and urged it as a reason why no one, however involved in sin, should hesitate to take indulgences.—Summa Sylvestrina s. v. *Indulgentia* § 20.

[4] Em. Sa Aphor. Confessar. s. v. *Indulgentia* § 2.—Polacchi Comment. in Bull. Urbani VIII. pp. 287–9.—Lavorii de Jubilæo et Indulg. P. II. Cap. xiv. n. 26–7.—Viva de Jubilæo ac Indulg. pp. 107–9.

[5] Bellarmini de Indulg. Lib. I. Cap. xiii.

[6] S. Antonini Summæ P. I. Tit. x. Cap. 3, § 5.

[7] Weigel Claviculæ Indulgent. Cap. xiv.

charity or the indulgence is not acquired.[1] Even as late as the middle of the seventeenth century the high authority of Pasqualigo requires the performance of the works in charity.[2] The laxer theory however inevitably prevailed. Prierias teaches that if the works are performed in sin they will revive if the penitent is in grace at the moment of obtaining remission or of death.[3] Bellarmine, as we have just seen, admitted this with respect to some objects only, but this distinction was too refined, and the rule was generally adopted for all indulgences, thus reducing to a minimum the requirement of temporary abstinence from sin.[4] Polacchi, while admitting it, cannot abstain from a protest; in applying it to the thirty visits to the churches required for the jubilee, he says it seems incongruous and vile that a sinner can make twenty-nine rounds in mortal sin and without contrition, and then at the end of the thirtieth obtain the indulgence by confession.[5] Such protests were unheeded, and all modern authorities, rigorist as well as laxist, seem to unite in the opinion that the state of grace is only necessary at the last moment of completing the prescribed works.[6] Onofri explains the process in his instructions to those desirous of obtaining the crociata indulgence in Naples: you pay for the bull, you select a confessor, you perform the works required, and the last of these is the application of the bull by the confessor, at which moment you must be in a state of grace.[7] The authoritative *Raccolta*, while recommending as desirable that the performance of the works should be preceded by confession, admits that the state of grace is only necessary at the end: in the case of partial indulgences, confession is not ordinarily

---

[1] Caietani Opusc. Tract. XV. Cap. ix.

[2] Pasqualigo Theoria et Praxis Jubilæi Q. 49.

[3] Summa Sylvestrina s. v. *Indulgentia*, § 31.

[4] Em. Sa Aphorismi Confessar. s. v. *Indulgentia* § 2.—Summa Diana s. v. *Indulgentiæ requisita* n. 3.

[5] Polacchi Comment. in Bull. Urbani VIII. p. 289.

[6] Juenin de Sacramentis Diss. XIII. Q. vi. Cap. 3.—Antoine Theol. Moral. De Pœnit. Append. Q. iii. n. 1.—Habert Comp. Theologiæ, De Pœnitentia Cap. v. Q. 8.—Ferraris Prompta Biblioth. s. v. *Indulgentia* Art. II. n. 41.—Bened. PP. XIV. Encyc. *Inter præteritos* § 76, 3 Dec. 1749 (Bullar. III. 106).—Liguori Theol. Moral. Lib. VI. n. 531 § 9.—Mig. Sanchez Exposit. Bullæ Cruciatæ, pp. 122-3.—Beringer, Die Ablässe, p. 63.

[7] Onofri, Spiegazione della Bolla della S. Crociata, pp. 183-4 (Napoli, 1778). Cf. Vella, Dissertatio in Bullam S. Cruciatæ, T. II. pp. 319 sqq. (Neapoli, 1789).

prescribed, but there is usually a clause "with at least a contrite heart," meaning that there must be at least a true act of contrition with a firm intention to confess.[1] Palmieri tells us that it is a disputed question among theologians whether the state of grace is requisite for partial indulgences; the common opinion is in the affirmative, but he inclines to the negative, while advising the other in practice as safer.[2] These questions, moreover, are seriously complicated by the coexistence of venial sins with the state of grace; while they do not involve the penalty of hell they must, if not remitted, incur that of purgatory. They are not required to be confessed; indeed complete confession of them is a virtually impossible task, and therefore they may be held to be always present, while unless their *culpa* has been removed the indulgence has no power over their *pœna*. Their existence during the performance of the enjoined works gives rise to many subtile distinctions; they may corrupt the good works or they may be of a nature to incur their own future punishment, while that of all other mortals and venials has been remitted.[3] Even a propensity, we are told, to a venial sin, while performing the works, will prevent that sin from enjoying the benefit of the indulgence, though the other sins obtain it.[4] In view of the extreme haziness of the distinction between mortals and venials it is evident that no one can feel certain that he is in a state of grace, and therefore Gröne's advice is good that even when not conscious of mortal sin it is prudent when seeking an indulgence always to confess and take communion.[5]

It may be gathered from all this that the condition frequently expressed in grants of indulgences, that they are for the truly repentant and confessed, has been subject to many different constructions. In the olden time, when indulgences were wholly a financial expedient, and the effort was to attract purchasers, there naturally was a laxer view entertained than at present when there is rarely such incentive. Even Gerson, after saying that only those actually confessed are capable of gaining indulgences, assumes that a vow or intention to confess may suffice, and St. Antonino accepts intention as sufficient

---

[1] Raccolta, p. xii. (Ed. 1886).
[2] Palmieri Tract. de Pœnit. p. 451.
[3] Zaccaria, Dell' Anno Santo, II. 25–8.
[4] Van Ranst Opusc. de Indulgent. p. 100.—Beringer, Die Ablässe, p. 62.
[5] Gröne, Der Ablass, pp. 138–9.

unless the indulgence specifies that it must have been performed within a month.[1] It was argued that if the "vere pœnitentibus et confessis" was to be strictly construed, there would be few, indeed, who would gain indulgences, and there grew to be a general consensus of opinion that it was fulfilled if the applicant had confessed at the previous Easter and proposed to do so at the next.[2] This lax construction continued until long after indulgences had ceased to be principally a method of raising money. In the seventeenth century the rule was that if a man confesses on Friday and sins mortally on Saturday before obtaining an indulgence, no further confession is necessary, and in the eighteenth Ferraris holds that no special confession is required.[3] All this naturally met with dissent from the rigorists. Antoine argues that if indulgences could be gained by the mere performance of the trifling works prescribed, they would cause destruction and not edification; they are not designed to favor torpor and negligence, but merely to supplement human infirmity and inability to merit pardon.[4] In the same sense as this was a celebrated pastoral instruction issued by Cardinal Denhoff, which had a wide circulation, with the approval of the papacy, and which assumed that the penitent must exhaust his efforts, for the Church only supplies what he cannot accomplish. Giunchi, who quotes this, adds that the Church is not superior to divine law, and is powerless to release the sinner from the obligations imposed by Christ to earn forgiveness by fruits meet for repentance.[5] Habert takes practically the same position.[6] By this time there were no interests at stake to stimulate opposition to these views, while the constant multiplication of indulgences for trivial observances threatened to bring the whole system into contempt, so the rigorist view gradually prevailed. Benedict XIV. was the first to specify, for his jubilee of 1750, that

---

[1] Jo. Gersonis Regulæ Morales, XXV. G. (Ed. 1488).—S. Antonini Summæ P. I. Tit. x. Cap. 3, § 2.

[2] Summa Angelica s. v. *Indulgentia* n. 17.—Summa Rosella s. v. *Indulgentia* § 22.—Steph. ex Nottis Opus Remissionis, fol. 11*a*.—Summa Sylvestrina s. v. *Indulgentia* § 20.

[3] Summa Diana s. v. *Jubilæum* n. 10, 12.—Potiti de Joriis Tract. de Suffragiis etc. p. 79.—Ferraris Prompta Biblioth. s. v. *Indulgentia* Art. III. n. 33–4.

[4] Antoine Theol. Moral. De Pœnit. Append. Q. iii. n. 3.

[5] Giunchi de Indulgentiis, pp. 71–4, 101–4.

[6] Habert Comp. Theol. De Pœnit. Cap. 5, n. 9.

not only confession but communion is requisite, and that this must be perfect in spirit as well as in form, for a sacrilegious sacrament would not suffice.[1] In 1759 the Congregation of Indulgences decided, against the opinion of the theologians, that confession, whether expressed or not, is an essential condition of indulgences, and the approval of this by Clement XIII. gave it the force of law. This was so radical a reform that it brought remonstrances from every quarter, and, in 1763, it was modified by exempting from it, except for jubilee indulgences, those who followed the laudable custom of weekly confession.[2] At the present time it may be assumed as a general rule that for plenaries both confession and communion are requisite, although those of prescription suffice, and several indulgences can be gained after one communion. By a decree of 1862, Pius IX., however, conceded that chronic invalids, unable to take the Eucharist could have the sacrament commuted by their confessors into some other pious work.[3]

In view of the necessity of confession and communion as conditions for gaining an indulgence, it would appear to be implied that absolution must also be a requisite, yet this has only been insisted upon in recent times. The question was repeatedly put to the Congregation of Indulgences, and was consistently answered in the negative in 1822, 1841, and 1847, but, in 1852, the decision was reversed and absolution was declared to be necessary. This leaves the matter in a somewhat dubious position, which the latest authority seeks to explain by a distinction, wholly unauthorized by the decrees, between mortal and venial sins.[4]

Very similar to the above have been the changes of theory as to the disposition requisite to enable the penitent to enjoy the advantages of an indulgence. We have seen, when discussing those *a culpa et*

[1] Zaccaria, Dell' Anno Santo, II. 37–8.

[2] Decret. Authent. n. 246, 264, 440, 583.—Bouvier, Traité des Indulgences, pp. 67–8.

[3] Raccolta, pp. xvi.–xx.—Decr. Authent. n. 532.—Bouvier, Traité des Indulgences p. 70.—Beringer, Die Ablässe, p. 67. The Abbé Cloquet informs us (Archives de la S. Congr. des Indulgences, 1862, pp. 6, 30–1) that confession and communion are requisite for seven years' indulgences as well as for plenaries.

[4] Cloquet, op. cit. pp. 42–44, 62.—Beringer, Die Ablässe, p. 68.

pœna, how deplorably lax was the distribution of the treasure prior to the Reformation, and how the payment of the required sum was virtually all that was regarded as essential. Dr. Weigel, as the representative of the reforming council of Bâle, however, taught that a proper disposition is necessary to merit indulgences.[1] His words fell upon deaf ears, for Caietano tells us that the universal opinion was that nothing was requisite save the state of grace, and as he is "singular" in denying this he asks a candid hearing for his argument, that those who seek indulgences merely as a substitute for penance do not gain them; it is only those eager to perform satisfaction who are worthy of the aid obtainable from them.[2] This reduced the value and the function of indulgences to the lowest expression, and, of course, found no favor. Pauliano, it is true, argues at much length against the lax custom which prevailed that the annual confession of precept sufficed to fulfil the condition of *vere pœnitentibus et confessis*, but he regards, as the most important element in the disposition of the sinner, full and unwavering faith in the efficacy of the pardon which he is to gain.[3] The council of Trent prudently abstained from any utterance on the subject, and the theologians were at liberty to frame definitions at their pleasure. Bellarmine says that he has found no writer who follows Caietano except Bartolommeo Fumo.[4] Diana taught that indulgences act *ex opere operato*, irrespective of the devotion or zeal of the recipient.[5] The Salamanca theologians hold that greater or less devotion has no influence on gaining the indulgence.[6] Pignatelli argues that the application of the treasure does not have to operate interiorly on him to whom it is conceded, but only exteriorly, and therefore no special disposition on his part is required. Want of devotion has no effect on the efficacy of the indulgence; the treasure is superabundant, and its application depends on the will of the grantor not on the disposition of the grantee; God has made a bargain, and is obliged to accept what is offered without respect to any lack of disposition on the part of the beneficiary. If an indulgence is offered

---

[1] Weigel Claviculæ Indulgent. Cap. 1.

[2] Caietani Opusc. Tract. x. De Indulg. Cap. 1.

[3] Pauliani de Jobilæo et Indulgentiis Lib. II. Cap. ii.

[4] Bellarmini de Indulg. Lib. I. Cap. xiii.

[5] Summa Diana s. v. *Indulgentiæ requisita* n. 5.

[6] Salmanticens. Cursus Theol. Moral. Append. Tract. VI. Cap. ii. n. 85.

for visiting a church, he who visits it out of curiosity, or occupied with carnal thoughts or playing and laughing, nevertheless gains it.[1] Bianchi recognized the dilemma which existed; if charity and devotion are not requisite, indulgences send the sinner to paradise in a carriage; if the penalty is remitted only in proportion to the zeal of the penitent, indulgences are superfluous and futile; he therefore seeks a compromise, and, after prescribing as an absolute essential supernatural charity, including the love of God above all things, detestation of sin and firm resolve to avoid it, and readiness to mortify the flesh, he applies the universal solvent of the treasure, through which he asserts that the indulgence supplies all deficiencies.[2] Viva reaches the result more directly, and asserts that the common opinion is that devotion has nothing to do with the efficacy of the indulgence.[3] Andreucci follows Suarez in requiring only *dispositio proxima*, which is either habitual, manifested by community of faith, or actual, which is shown by performance of the works enjoined; the modern doctrine of the rigorists that perfect charity is requisite he holds to be pious but unnecessary.[4] On the other hand, Dr. Amort argues that the immense multiplication of plenaries can only be justified by requiring zeal in the recipients, otherwise the popes would sin in granting them so freely; they are everywhere attainable with trifling exertion, and if nothing more is needed the effect on morals must be deplorable.[5] Giunchi admits that Andreucci represents the prevailing opinion, but he urges that the efficacy of the indulgence must be in proportion to the love and piety and devotion with which the works enjoined are performed.[6] Father de Charmes repeats this and adds that the disposition requisite to obtain complete remission of the *pœna* is so rare that it cannot be employed as an example.[7]

[1] Pignatelli, Il Giubileo dell' Anno Santo, pp. 80, 86–7, 121, 123. Giacomo Pignatelli was one of the most distinguished theologians and canon lawyers of the seventeenth century. See Hurter, Nomenclator Literarius Theol. Catholicæ, II. 222.

[2] Bianchi, Foriero dell' Anno Santo, pp. 112, 128–9.

[3] Viva de Jubilæo ac Indulg. pp. 114–5.

[4] Andreucci de Requisitis ad lucrandas Indulgentias, pp. viii.–xii.

[5] Amort de Indulg. II. 211.

[6] Giunchi de Indulg. pp. 67–70. Cf. Valsecchi, Delle Indulgenze e delle Disposizioni per conseguirle, pp. 190–1 (Firenze, 1734).

[7] Th. ex Charmes Theol. Univ. Diss. v. Append. Cap. iii. Q. 4, Art. 1.

A significant illustration of the antagonism in this matter between theory and practice is afforded by the book which Padre Onofri wrote at the instance of the authorities to explain the crociata indulgence granted to Naples in 1778. He insists that the perfunctory performance of the works prescribed will avail nothing; there must be deep contrition, hatred of past sins and striving after God, for this is the divine law and the indulgence is conditioned by it. This apparently did not conduce to the success of the speculation, for in subsequent instructions he assures the people that all that is required is to take the bull and pay the price—"bolla presa, limosna pagata, tutto è fatto," for the visits to the churches and the prayers are simple enough; you must be in a state of grace at the end, and if you are in mortal sin confession is well for greater safety, but it is not required by the bull, nor is it needed for the Stations of Rome, and learned theologians hold that an act of contrition suffices with an intention of subsequent confession.[1] In this case there was money at stake. In more modern times, where this incentive to laxity is absent, the tendency is to greater rigor. A collection of indulgences, in 1803, prescribes communion, a sincere detestation of all past sins, the firmest resolve to sin no more and an ardent desire to satisfy God by appropriate penance; even after the indulgence is gained this ardor should not be relaxed and the performance of penitential works should be continued.[2] Gröne asserts that without the proper disposition indulgences cannot be gained; there must be a complete change in the old sinful man, so that their worthy acquisition is a most important and most healing means of virtue, and urging the faithful to their zealous use is the chief duty of spiritual manuals and directors of souls.[3] So the official *Raccolta* assures us that the most essential condition is the perfect detestation and complete abandonment of sin.[4] All this is highly creditable, yet one cannot help

---

[1] Onofri, Spiegazione della Bolla della S. Crociata, pp. 197–202 (Napoli, 1778); Sermoni, pp. 121–3 (Napoli, 1783).

[2] Raccolta di Indulgenze, pp. 34–5 (Camerino, 1803).

[3] Gröne, Der Ablass, pp. 3–4, 170–3.

[4] Raccolta, p. xxv.—So Beringer (Die Ablässe, p. 47) asserts that contrition and amendment are indispensable conditions. The same doctrine is taught in Butler's Catechism—"*Q.* To whom does the Church grant indulgences? *A.* To such only as are in a state of grace and are sincerely desirous to amend their lives and to satisfy God's justice by penitential works."

asking how those who hold such views can answer the argument of the older moralists, who pointed out that, if this be necessary, indulgences are superfluous and useless, for the penitent, by such contrition, absolution and satisfaction, can escape the penalty as well as the guilt, while the sinner may not unreasonably look back with longing to the medieval times when he was practically taught that the payment of a prescribed sum assured his direct passage to heaven without detention in purgatory.

While there has been this revolution of theory as to the necessity of the *dispositio congrua* there has not been much change with regard to the necessity of the performance of whatever works are prescribed. In the older time, when these works, for the most part, consisted in the payment of money or service in the holy wars of the Church, of course they were rigidly enforced. It is true that during the crusades there was a troublesome question whether a man who died, after taking the cross and before reaching Palestine, gained the indulgence, but this, it was settled, depended on the terms of the concession—if it was for taking the cross he gained it, if for service in the Holy Land, he did not.[1] The rule was also laid down that the performance must be personal; it is not easy to see in what the distinction consisted between this and the penitential works of satisfaction which could be performed vicariously, but Aquinas decided that no one can earn an indulgence and apply it to another, and his opinion was accepted, unless, indeed, it was otherwise provided in the grant.[2] The popes were in the habit of granting Holy Land

[1] S. Th. Aquin. Quodlibet II. Art. xvi.—Jo. Friburgens. Summæ Confessor. Lib. III. Tit. xxxiv. Q. 192.—Astesani Summæ Lib. v. Tit. xl. Art. 1. Q. 4.

[2] S. Th. Aquin. in IV. Sentt. Dist. xx. Q. 5 ad 2; Summæ Suppl. Q. xxvii. Art. 3.—Jo. Friburg. Summæ Lib. III. Tit. xxxiv. Q. 188.—Astesani Summæ Lib. v. Tit. xl. Art. 2, Q. 3; Art. 5, Q. 4.—Weigel Claviculæ Indulgent. Cap. lviii.—Bianchi, Foriero dell' Anno Santo, pp. 137–40, 278.

There seems to have been some difference of opinion about this. Rodriguez (Bolla della Crociata, p. 100) admits the vicarious performance of the works, when conceded by the pope, but denies that a man can gain an indulgence and then transfer it. Pignatelli (Il Giubileo dell' Anno Santo, p. 94) and Ferraris (Prompta Biblioth. s. v. *Indulgentia*, Art. II. n. 41) insist on personal performance except as to the act of giving the "alms." Gröne (Der Ablass, pp. 139–40) seem to think there is no difficulty in having the work performed vicariously.

indulgences to those who sent substitutes as well as to those who served personally, and in the grants to churches it became understood as a valuable feature in the concession, that the pardon could be earned by those who visited them by proxy and sent their oblations, for the *quæstuarii* who peddled the indulgence through the land served as messengers, and nothing was required but to pay the money to them.[1]

With this understanding the personal and rigorous performance of the prescribed works was insisted on. Astesanus tells us that the indulgence is granted for the purpose expressed in it; good will to perform does not suffice, nor intention, even if some unavoidable impediment arises.[2] Pauliano holds that a pilgrim to Rome for the jubilee, who dies before he has completed the prescribed fifteen rounds of the churches, does not gain the indulgence.[3] Since the money feature of the system has become subordinate post-Tridentine theologians are equally rigid. Tomás Sanchez and Lavorio assert that any defect in the performance arising from negligence vitiates the whole.[4] The utmost precision is declared to be indispensable, and every condition of time and place must be observed; if communion is prescribed on Sunday it does not suffice if taken on a week-day.[5] It is true that Liguori is not so precise and makes allowance for human infirmities, but the *Raccolta* says the most minute attention to every detail is essential—whether prayers are to be recited standing or kneeling, at the sound of the bell, at a certain hour, on a certain day, and any omission through ignorance, negligence, or impotence prevents the acquisition of the indulgence.[6] Yet there would seem to be one way in which the performance of the works can be evaded. Viva tells us that if a man is confessed

---

[1] The indulgence granted, in 1517, by Leo X. to the hospital at Nürnberg, which will be found in the Appendix, is of this kind; other similar grants by him are in the Regesta, Hergenröther, n. 11857, 16840.

Azpilcueta (Comment. de Jobilæo, Notab. XXXI. n. 33) admits that such indulgences are possible, but says that he has never seen or heard of one, although the Portiuncula, as we shall see, was a notorious example.

[2] Astesani Summæ Lib. v. Tit. xl. Art. 1, Q. 4; Art. 5, Q. 3.

[3] Pauliani de Jobilæo et Indulgentiis p. 179.

[4] Th. Sanchez in Præcepta Decalogi Lib. v. Cap. 5, n. 6.—Lavorii de Indulg. P. I. Cap. xiii. n. 8–11.

[5] Summa Diana s. v. *Jubilæum* n. 13.—Antoine Theol. Moral. De Pœnit. Append. Q. iii, n. 2.—Bianchi, Foriero dell' Anno Santo, pp. 264, 273.

[6] S. Alph. de Ligorio Lib. VI. n. 534 § 14.—Raccolta, p. xiii.

and absolved by virtue of the jubilee, and then intentionally omits the works, it is universally admitted that he remains absolved; some doctors even say that he commits no sin, others that it is venial and others that it is mortal.[1]

Yet this extreme rigor does not exclude some concessions to facilitate the acquisition of indulgences. When prayers in churches are prescribed, if the penitent goes so early that the church is not open, or if the crowd is so great that he cannot enter, he can offer his orisons outside.[2] When visits and prayers at five altars are required, if there are five altars in a church, Diana says that they can be made from the same spot, by merely changing the intention, while Trullench holds that there should be some motion of the body to distinguish one from another, and that when one altar is to be visited five times it can be done without change of position by inclining the head five times.[3] There has been some discussion which of these views is correct, but the difference is immaterial, and the general principle is admitted, with perhaps the addition of crossing oneself at each change of altar.[4]

Many indulgences, especially extraordinary jubilees, prescribe visiting a church and offering up prayers for the exaltation of the faith, the concord of Christian princes, the extermination of heresy, victory over the infidel, and the conservation and intention of the pope. This is a somewhat formidable task for an uncultured penitent, and it is charitably simplified. Van Ranst, indeed, asserts that it should not be a mere Pater and Ave, but a distinct prayer for the intentions of the pope, not mental but vocal.[5] Diana however had long before said that any prayers in any language suffice, uttered while sitting or standing, with head covered or uncovered, briefly or at length, and

[1] Viva de Jubilæo ac Indulg. pp. 148–50.

[2] Rodriguez, Bolla della Crociata, p. 99.—Summa Diana s. v. *Bulla Cruciatæ* n. 13.—Onofri, Spiegazione della Bolla della S. Crociata, pp. 215.

Thus in the Roman jubilee we are told that the churches can be visited at night, and if the doors are closed it makes no difference.—Potiti de Joriis Tract. de Suffragiis etc. p. 185.

[3] Summa Diana s. v. *Bulla Cruciatæ* n. 12, 14.—Trullench Exposit. Bullæ Cruciatæ Lib. I. § vi. Dub. 2, n. 4.

[4] Leti MS. Tract. de Indulgentiis, fol. 35.—Busenbaum Medullæ Theol. Moral. Lib. VI. Tract. ii. Art. 2, § 1, n. 17.—Onofri, *op. cit.* pp. 209–10.—Mig. Sanchez Exposit. Bulla S. Cruciatæ, pp. 141–2.

[5] Van Ranst Opusc. de Indulg. p. 111.

that it is a disputed question whether mental prayer does not answer.[1] This has been generally accepted, the usual advice being five or seven Paters and Aves, or any prayer occupying equal time,[2] and the practice was sanctioned, in 1841, by the Congregation of Indulgences, which decided that the penitent might use any prayer he pleased, and, in 1847, it added that no explicit intention expressed in words is requisite.[3]

Another condition for gaining indulgences, about which opinion has not been uniform, is the intention of the penitent. This is a point which escaped the attention of the older theologians, for when the pardons offered involved the gift of money or actual service or pilgrimage, intention to gain them was inseparable from the act, and there could arise no question for debate. With the modern immense multiplication of indulgences to confraternities and for many ordinary religious observances, it becomes however a matter of some importance to determine whether they can be gained unknowingly and involuntarily. With regard to this opinions seem almost equally divided. Rodriguez asserts that there must be at least virtual intention; a visit to a church for recreation or to meet a woman does not suffice, though the object may be mixed without forfeiting the indulgence.[4] Some moralists of distinction went even further than this

---

[1] Summa Diana s. v. *Indulgentiæ Requisita* n. 6.

[2] Serrada, Escudo del Carmelo p. 371.—Onofri, *op. cit.* pp. 210–11.—Raccolta di Indulgenze, Camerino, 1803, pp. 35–6.—Guglielmi, Recueil des Indulgences, pp. 143–4.—Bouvier, Traité des Indulgences, p. 73.—Cloquet, Les Plus faciles Indulgences, p. 6.—Mig. Sanchez Expos. Bullæ S. Cruciatæ p. 145.—Le Jubilé Universel de 1875, p. 23 (Toulouse).—Maurel und Schneider, Die Ablässe, p. 89.

[3] Decreta Authentica n. 534, 620.

[4] Rodriguez, Bolla della Crociata, p. 98.

It is perhaps necessary to explain that moralists classify intention as actual, virtual, habitual and interpretative. Actual is when the intention is present and active during the performance of an act. Virtual is when an act is performed in virtue of an intention previously formed and not revoked, though not remembered at the moment. Habitual is when the previous intention has not been revoked, but has been so interrupted as to be no longer effective. Interpretative is that which a man has not but would have if he happened to think of the matter (Ferraris, Prompta Bibliotheca s. v. *Intentio*). Yet these definitions are by no means universally agreed upon. There are two or three different formulas respecting virtual intention. Viva (Theol. Trutina in Prop. XXVIII. Alexand. VIII.) and Bouvier (Traité des Indulgences, p. 63) class habitual and interpretative together. In the infinite variety and gradation of

and argued that if the work were performed out of vain-glory or other evil motive still the indulgence was obtained.[1] The laxer school in general simply held that no intention is necessary; the indulgence works *ex opere operato* and can be acquired unconsciously; a visit to a church made through curiosity will gain an indulgence that happens to be attached to it on that day.[2] The rigorists insist on actual or at least virtual intention.[3] As a rule however it seems to be generally accepted that interpretative suffices and is required, but virtual would appear to be regarded as desirable, for there has been for the last two hundred years the frequent repetition of the advice to form every morning the intention of gaining all the indulgences that may be attached to any pious works that one may perform that day, for in this way a virtual intention, which lasts for twenty-four hours, exists and secures beyond doubt any pardons that might otherwise be lost, and thus during a life-time a large amount of spiritual treasure is accumulated for the hour of death. Serrada adds that it is well to supplement this with an application to the souls in purgatory of all that can be so applied, for then if one is not in a state of grace to enjoy the indulgences they will at least be utilized and not return to the body of the treasure. In this way, moreover, as Bouvier says, it becomes unnecessary to know what are the indulgences attached to a certain act, or even that there are any; they are acquired all the same.[4]

There has been some dispute as to the necessity of another condition on the part of the recipient—that he should at the time be in need

---

human thought and motive it is of course impossible to frame in the closet a classification which will not break down in the application.

[1] Salmanticens. Cursus Theol. Moral. Append. Tract. VI. Cap. ii. n. 81.—Gab. Beati Quæstiones Morales Q. 10 de Legibus n. 20; Fr Bellegambe Enchirid. de Jubilæo Sect. III. Q. 4 (Amort de Indulg. II. 191, 194).

[2] Summa Diana s. v. *Indulgentiæ requisita* n. 5.—Tofi da Bettona, Trattato dell' Indulgenza d'Assisi, p. 89.—Leti MS. Tract. de Indulg. Sect. 5.—Viva de Jubilæo ac Indulg. pp. 110–13.

[3] Van Ranst Opusc. de Indulg. p. 101.—Raccolta di Indulgenze, p. 34 (Camerino, 1803).

[4] Bianchi, Foriero dell' Anno Santo, pp. 121–5, 251–2, 268.—Serrada, Escudo del Carmelo, pp. 314–15.—S. Alph. de Ligorio Theol. Moral. Lib. VI. n. 534, § 14.—Jouhanneaud, Dict. des Indulgences, p. 218.—Les Scapulaires, Paris, 1870, p. 5.—Raccolta, p. xii. (Ed. 1886).—Bouvier, Traité des Indulgences, pp. 63–4.—Palmieri Tract. de Pœnit. pp. 451, 481.

of the indulgence. This seems to be decided in the affirmative for the sensible reason that if a man not in want of indulgence can gain them and lay them up, as it were, in stock for future consumption, it would afford temptation to sin, arising from the knowledge that the punishment was already paid for in advance.[1] Yet it is not easy to distinguish morally between this and the practice (see p. 83) which includes in the benefits of indulgences sins committed in expectation of obtaining them.

From all of the above it is evident that the gaining of an indulgence is a very uncertain thing, and that in modern times there can be no such confidence felt as was so freely expressed during the middle ages, when sinners were taught that death-bed plenaries carry the soul direct to heaven, and when the absolution formula under them declared "I restore thee to the innocence in which thou wert when baptized."[2] The Church has now no such object in fostering certainty as it had then, while, on the other hand, in the existing lavish liberality with which indulgences are granted and the extreme facility of the works prescribed, if there were no doubt as to their acquisition there would be little demand for masses for the dead. Even before the Reformation, however, the individual rigor of Caietano, as we have seen, called in question the validity of the numerous indulgences issued without sufficient cause, and the winning of them by those who had not the *dispositio congrua* of satisfying for themselves, the inference from which was that any sinner who sought one for the purpose of escaping penance failed to secure it.[3] Caietano's disciple, Bartolommeo Fumo, deplores the abundance of indulgences which render men prone to sin and tepid in satisfying for it, whence it arises that nearly all are miserably deceived and fail to obtain the remission which they think they gain.[4] After Pius V. had forbidden eleemosynary indulgences there was less hesitation in admitting their uncertainty. Pallavicino finds in this the extraordinary reason in their favor that as no one feels con-

---

[1] Potiti de Joriis Tract. de Suffragiis etc. p. 69.

[2] S. Antonini Summæ P. I. Tit. x. Cap. 3, § 5. If St. Antonino objects to this clause it is because he regards it as superfluous.

[3] Caietani Opusc. Tract. IX. Q. 1, 2; Tract. X. Q. 1.

[4] Aurea Armilla s. v. *Indulgentia* n. 12, 13.

fident of gaining them they lead him to supplement them with pious works, not recognizing that this, carried out to its legitimate conclusion, is an unanswerable argument against the whole system.[1] Dr. Amort assures us that, in spite of the theologians who seek to prove the facility of obtaining indulgences, the people have not lost the true doctrine, and nearly all believe that a plenary is so difficult to earn that hardly two men out of a hundred thousand succeed.[2] Père Antoine virtually agrees with this when he says that there are few indeed who do so.[3] Recent authorities for the most part agree as to this uncertainty, and it is commonly urged as a reason for seeking to get as many of them as possible, apparently with the conviction that imperfect ones may supplement each other.[4]

There is another question which has been touched upon above (p. 44) and which requires further consideration, as it has given rise to an immense amount of controversy—to what extent the gaining of an indulgence releases the penitent from the obligation of performing penance. This has become of less importance in modern times with the multiplication of plenaries and the minimizing of sacramental satisfaction, but there is a principle involved over which the laxist and rigorist schools have conducted an active discussion. Among the latter, however disguised, there is to be discerned a curious secret sense of doubt as to the real efficacy of the pardons and a strong desire to conceal this by inventing reasons more or less plausible to answer the inevitable question why, if indulgences are worth what they promise, it should be necessary or advisable to perform the penance which their function is to replace.

In the earlier period plenaries were given only for crusades and

[1] Pallavicini Hist. Conc. Trident. Lib. XXIV. Cap. xii. n. 6.

[2] Amort de Indulgent. II. 255.

[3] Antoine Theol. Moral. De Pœnit. Append. Q. iii. n. 3.

[4] Gröne, Der Ablass, p. 141.—The Golden Book of the Confraternities, p. 283.—Bouvier, Traité des Indulgences, pp. 26–7, 31.—Jouhanneaud, Dict. des Indulgences, p. 151.—Beringer, Die Ablässe, p. 62.

The latest authority, however, argues that indulgences are easily acquired. The works are plain and simple and can be performed with facility; "the difficulty of placing oneself in a state of grace is not so very great;" the only real difficulty lies "in being detached from every affection to venial sin," but this does not infer abstention from venial sin.—Lépicier, Indulgences, their Origin, Nature and Development, pp. 342–3 (London, 1895).

scarcely come into consideration, while partials were mostly for definite portions of enjoined penance, and would certainly seem to remit them, yet Alain de Lille, William of Auxerre, and William of Paris emphatically insist on the performance of the penance, the latter even saying that it would be the height of folly not to perform it.[1] William of Rennes timidly observes that, if the penitent gives the requisite "alms" piously and devoutly and with full faith in the indulgence, he thinks, without prejudice to others, that he will not transgress if he omits the penance.[2] Cardinal Henry of Susa admits that there is no question as to plenaries, for he who obtains one flies at once to heaven if he dies without further sin, but as to partial remissions of enjoined penance he presents an elaborate argument which is worth condensing. The indulgence undoubtedly releases from penance, *quoad* the Church Militant, but he who gains one had better not use it in this world, but reserve it for purgatory. He is not compelled to perform the penance, for it is replaced by the indulgence, but it enervates the satisfaction, and he cannot know whether the priest has imposed what is requisite, which is rarely the case now-a-days. Besides, many mortal sins are embraced in the commission of a single one, and as what is not purged here must be purged in purgatory, he is a fool and a simpleton who does not reserve it, for thus he will suffer that much less in purgatory, and the punishment there of a single day is worse than a hundred here.[3] Of course, when indulgences came to be considered as covering all the penance that ought to be enjoined and not merely what was enjoined, part of this reasoning did not apply, but nearly all the leading authorities throughout the middle ages followed this line of thought, though various excuses were presented for it—indulgences remit the penance, but still its performance is advisable, and this applied to plenaries as well as partials.[4] There were some exceptions

---

[1] Alani de Insulis contra Hæreticos Lib. II. Cap. xi.—Guill. Altissiodor. Lib. IV. De Relaxionibus (Amort de Indulg. II. 61).—Guill. Paris. de Sacram. Ordinis Cap. xiii.

[2] Guill. Redonens. Postill. super S. Raymundi Summæ Lib. III. Tit. xxxiv. § 5.

[3] Hostiens. Aureæ Summæ Lib. V. De Remiss. § 8.

[4] Alex. de Ales Summæ P. IV. Q. XXIII. Art. ii. Membr. 6.—Alb. Mag. in IV. Sentt. Dist. XX. Art. 17.—S. Th. Aquin. in IV. Sentt. Dist. XX. Q. iii. ad 4; Summæ Suppl. Q. XXV. Art. 1 ad 4.—Jo. Friburgens. Summæ Confessor.

to this. Bishop William Durand and Pierre de la Palu assert that indulgences do not release from penance, in spite of the argument freely used that if this is the case the pope is deceiving the faithful.[1] Dr. Weigel boldly says that forty days of penance are much better than forty days of indulgence, and therefore it is childish to replace performance of satisfaction with an indulgence, although the latter may help the sick and those inclined to sin.[2] On the other hand, Durand de S. Pourçain holds that if the penance is performed the indulgence does no good, except that the superfluous merit is carried to the credit of the performer and set against his future sins, while Baptista Tornamala says that the equivalent has been given from the treasure, and that to require satisfaction is to belittle the power of indulgences.[3]

The rigid virtue of Cardinal Caietano swept away all subterfuges. An indulgence, he says, has no power to make men better; it confers no merits, but only remits a penalty which could be remitted by penance; no one who neglects to satisfy acquires the fruits of an indulgence; if men would ask for and perform sufficing penance, they would render themselves worthy of indulgences, and the golden age of the Fathers would return. Unfortunately even Caietano could not elevate himself above the sordid venality of the period, and the one form of penance which he recommends is the payment of money—if enough is paid for the indulgence it restrains avarice and produces the most medicinal effect.[4] Caietano's disciple, Bar-

Lib. III. Tit. xxxiv. Q. 190.—Astesani Summæ Lib. v. Tit. xl. Art. 1. Q. 3.—Summa Pisanella s. v. *Indulgentia* § iv.—S. Antonini Summæ P. I. Tit. x. Cap. 3, § 3.—Steph. ex Nottis Opus Remissionis fol. 9*a*, 146*b*, 150*a*.—Summa Sylvestrina s. v. *Indulgentia* § 23.

Stefano Notti, however, draws a distinction between plenaries and partials (*op. cit.* fol. 155*b*).

[1] Durandi Speculi Lib. IV. Partic. iv. De Pœn. et Remiss. n. 9.—P. de Palude in IV. Sentt. Dist. XX. Q. iv. ad 2 Concl. 2.

[2] Weigel Claviculæ Indulgent. Cap. viii. xxx. xxxix. xlii.

[3] Durand. de S. Porciano in IV. Sentt. Dist. XX. Q. iv. § 9.—Summa Rosella s. v. *Indulgentia* § 15.

In 1373 Gregory XI. ordered that all confessional letters empowering the confessor to grant plenary indulgence at death should contain a clause conditioning it on the penitent's fasting on Fridays for a year after receiving the letter (Tangl, Die päpstlichen Kanzlei-Ordnungen, pp. 307-9), but this does not appear to have been long enforced.

[4] Caietani Opusc. Tract. VIII. De Indulg. Q. 2; Tract. X. De Indulg. Q. 1; Tract. XV. Cap. x.; Tract. XVI. De Indulg. Q. iv.

As we have seen above, in the St. Peter's bull *Liquet omnibus*, which led to

tolommeo Fumo, reflects the confusion of thought on the subject in the sixteenth century; indulgences, he says, are effective only for the worthy, but he who neglects to satisfy for himself is unworthy—yet it is not necessary to perform the enjoined penance, although it is advisable to do so.[1]

The council of Trent, as usual, threw no light on the question, although it affected the validity of all the countless indulgences that the faithful were everywhere seeking as a precaution against purgatory, and the theologians were left to wrangle over the insoluble problem. They were beginning to divide themselves into the rigorist and laxist schools, although there was no well-defined line of demarcation, and on this subject the simple considerations of morality were somewhat obscured by the question involved of the papal power as the distributor of the treasure. Thus in spite of the rigidity of S. Carlo Borromeo, when, in 1576, the jubilee of 1575 was extended to Milan, he urged his people to gain it, because they would thereby be liberated wholly from the obligation of satisfying in this life or in purgatory for every sin which they had committed since baptism, as if they were again regenerated in the sacred font.[2] Domingo Soto, as a rule, was not given to laxity, but he asserts that William of Paris and Pierre de la Palu and Cardinal Caietano were in error in requiring the performance of penance; the bulls prescribe what works are to be done; if penance is also necessary, the pope is deceiving the faithful.[3] These views merely reflected the current practice. In 1581 the council of Rouen, in deploring the multiplication and facility of indulgences, complains that the gravest crimes are pardoned without requiring satisfaction or restitution of ill-acquired gains, weakening ecclesiastical discipline and encouraging the wicked to the commission of even greater offences.[4] It was to

---

the Lutheran revolt, the "salutary penance" to be imposed on sinners was the payment of money for the building.

[1] Aurea Armilla s. v. *Indulgentia* §§ 13, 17.

[2] S. Carlo Borromeo, Letere Pastorali per il Santo Giubileo (Acta Eccles. Mediolanens. Mediolani 1846, p. 1291).—"Per la plenaria Indulgenza del Giubileo potete esser liberati affatto da ogni obligo di sodisfattione o pena temporale c' habbiate da fare in questa vita o dopo nel fuoco del Purgatorio per qualsivoglia peccato vostro, dal giorno che riceveste il sacro Battesimo sino all' hora presente, com foste hora regenerati nel sacro Battesimo."

[3] Dom. Soto in IV. Sentt. Dist. XXI. Q. ii, Art. 3.

[4] C. Rotomagens. ann. 1581, De Episc Offic. n. 36 (Harduin. X. 1234).

be expected, therefore, that "benignant" theologians like Escobar should assert that a plenary extinguishes all penance, and that Pasqualigo should argue that indulgences are multiplied in order to enable sinners too tepid to satisfy for themselves to satisfy out of the treasure.[1] In this, however, an exception came to be made in favor of so-called "medicinal" penance. We have seen (II. p. 299) the growth of this description of penance in spite of the effort of the council of Trent, and it afforded a convenient middle ground, as it is not essential to satisfaction. Various authors, therefore, took the position that, while plenaries relieved the sinner from all vindictive satisfaction, they did not exempt from the performance of observances imposed for his future amendment,[2] but the high authority of Ferraris denies even this, and asserts that it is a mistake to regard the performance of medicinal penance as necessary. He thinks it well, however, for the confessor to impose and the penitent to accept some light penance, for, though it is not essential, it adds greatly to his merit.[3] This is measurably a return to the teaching of the schoolmen, which is also accepted by Lavorio, while Polacchi suggests a more ingenious compromise, that when the penance is light it should be performed; when onerous an indulgence can be taken to escape it.[4] Bianchi argues that when a penitent obtains a plenary the confessor is not to impose any penance, except what is absolutely necessary to perfect the sacrament.[5] Benedict XIV. was desirous of placing a limit on all this laxity, which he characterized as too great, and, in the elaborate instructions for his jubilee of 1750, he required that penance should be imposed, and that the penitent should endeavor to perform it with all his strength,[6] but Liguori argues this away, and concludes that any penance will answer that perfects the sacrament.[7] Benedict's action led to penance being

[1] Escobar Theol. Moral. Tract. VII. Examin. iv. n. 34.—Pasqualigo Theoria et Praxis Jubilei Q. XXXIII. n. 5–8.

[2] Quarti, Trattato del Giubileo, pp. 36, 38, 250.—Pignatelli, Il Giubileo dell' Anno Santo, pp. 3, 8, 12, 424.

[3] Ferraris Prompta Bibloth. s. v. *Indulgentia* Art. III. n. 4–8.

[4] Lavorii de Indulgent. P. II. Cap. x. n. 93–4.—Polacchi Comment. in Bull. Urbani VIII. pp. 336–7.

[5] Bianchi, Foriero dell' Anno Santo, p. 129.

[6] Bened. PP. XIV. Encyc. *Inter præteritos* § 65, 3 Dec. 1749 (Bullar. III. 100).

[7] S. Alph. de Ligorio Theol. Moral. Lib. VI. n. 519.

prescribed in the succeeding jubilees of 1775 and 1825,[1] and in 1778 Onofri accepts it, although in opposition to the weight of theological opinion, because, he says, indulgences are now so numerous and common, that without such a rule there would be no opportunity left of imposing sacramental penance[2]—a somewhat damaging argument which he borrowed from the learned Zaccaria.[3]

Among those less inclined to extreme laxity there is every shade of opinion to be found, from Rodriguez who tells us that those seeking indulgences should be exhorted to perform penance, because, although it is unnecessary, the people ought not to be allowed to know it, and Henriquez who says that the penitent ought not to think that he is released from penance because it is part of the sacrament and trains him in good works,[4] to Valère Renaud, van Est, and Juenin, who hold that full satisfaction must be performed, and that otherwise an indulgence is valueless.[5] Chiericato follows Caietano, though he admits that this is in opposition to the common opinion of theologians and the current practice of the Church, while Pontas characterizes it as a great mistake to suppose that, by a few short prayers and trifling alms, a man can escape the penalty of all his sins, for the surest way of obtaining indulgences is to merit them by laborious penance.[6] Dr. Amort requires satisfaction *de congruo*

---

[1] Zaccaria, Dell' Anno Santo, II. 138.

Leo XII., in proclaiming the jubilee of 1825, explains that some satisfaction is requisite to perfect the sacrament, and therefore orders a light penance to be imposed.—Const. *Charitate Christi* §§ 6, 7, 25 Dec. 1825 (Bullar. Contin. VIII. 554).

I have not been able to consult the encyclical of Pius IX. proclaiming the jubilee of 1850, but in one which he issued in 1851 there is no reference to the injunction of penance.—Pii PP. IX. Encyc. *Ex aliis* (Acta P. I. pp. 348–52).

[2] Onofri, Spiegazione della Bolla della S. Crociata, pp. 238–41. In 1783, however, Onofri asserts that the penitent has nothing to do save to perform the visits to churches prescribed in the bull—if with devotion, so much the better, if without he still gains the indulgence.—Sermoni, pp. 124–5.

[3] Zaccaria, Dell' Anno Santo, II. 12–15.

[4] Rodriguez, Esplicazione della Bolla della S. Crociata, pp. 8, 29, 83.—Henriquez Summæ Theol. Moral. Lib. v. Cap. xxii. n. 6.

[5] Reginaldi Praxis Fori Pœnit. Lib. VII. n. 197.—Estii in IV. Sentt. Dist. XX. §§ 3, 8.—Juenin de Sacramentis Diss. XIII. Q. 5, Cap. 4: Q. 6, Cap. 2.

[6] Clericati de Pœnit. Decis. III. n. 11–15.—Pontas, Dict. de Cas de Conscience s. v. *Indulgences*. See also Antoine, Theol. Moral. De Pœnit. Append.

—that is, as much as the penitent can endure—if *de condigno* was exacted, all indulgences would be in vain. This principle, he says, was then (1732) almost universal in France, and he proceeds to justify it by some forcible arguments based on his theory (supra, p. 7) of the use of indulgences in the primitive Church. From the time of the apostles for a thousand years the Church granted no indulgence which relieved the sinner from performing congruous satisfaction: therefore it either had not the power, or it was a cruel mother depriving her children of the relief which was within reach; but the latter supposition is impossible, wherefore the former must be correct. Again, from the time of the apostles to the year 1391, there was granted no plenary indulgence attainable by men, women, and children of every race and nation, and thus again the Church was tyrannous, depriving her children of the treasure and the blood of Christ, and forcing them to choose between the severest penance and purgatory, or else she was ignorant that there was any remedy. There is, moreover, no trouble in gathering abundant evidence from conciliar canons and papal decrees, since the introduction of indulgences, that satisfaction is requisite as well as indulgences; the difficulty seems to be that the practice of the Church is not in accordance with its teaching, and it ought to recognize that to remove the obligation of satisfaction by indulgences is inconsistent with divine justice, prudent legislation, and the good of the Church and of the faithful.[1] Father de Charmes is equally uncompromising, and reduces the value of indulgences till it is scarce more than nominal; they are efficacious only with those intending to satisfy God fully, and to the argument that if this be the case they are useless, he replies that they diminish the satisfaction required in proportion to the greater or less fervor and piety of the penitent.[2]

In this debate between the rival schools of laxists and rigorists the only possible arbiter refused to render a decision. When, in 1737, the question was formally put to the Congregation of Indulgences, stating that it was a subject of great discussion between theologians whether the enjoined works suffice or whether works of satisfaction

---

§ iii., Van Ranst Opusc. de Indulg. p. 44, Giunchi de Indulgent. p. 131, Feyjoo, Cartas, T. I. n. 45, Valsecchi, Delle Indulgenze, Cap. XIV.

[1] Amort de Indulgent. II. 208–9, 247.

[2] Th. ex Charmes Theol. Univ. Diss. V. Append. Cap. III. Q. iv. Art. 1.

are requisite in addition, the only answer was that the matter was postponed, that no further enquiries must be made about it.[1] Thus in the absence of any authoritative definition by the Holy See there would appear to be considerable latitude of practice, and it would not be easy to determine what is the prevailing custom, though the question has lost much of its practical importance in the minimized penance of the present day, which is scarce more than enough to maintain the integrity of the sacrament. Vindictive satisfaction having been virtually superseded by indulgences easily gained, it makes little difference, except in theory, whether it is performed or not. Still, as of old, there are differences of opinion. Bishop Bouvier holds that the penitent should never be authorized to neglect his penance on the plea that he has obtained or will obtain an indulgence, although a diminished penance may be imposed on that account. Jouhanneaud, in stating that it is safer to perform it, is apparently careful to avoid assuming that this is requisite, for he bases his advice on the ground either of its being a remedy, or a precaution for the future, or a token of gratitude, or a means of edification, or simply an exhibition of obedience and faith.[2] "The Golden Book of the Confraternities" is equally careful when it cautions the penitent that it would be a fatal error so to rely on the certainty of having gained an indulgence as to neglect the performance of penance.[3] Palmieri says that a plenary indulgence supersedes the performance of penance, as it removes the foundation on which the injunction of penance rests, but this is not the case with partials.[4] Miguel Sanchez summarizes the situation by saying that it is a question constantly arising in the confessional, and that there are three opinions concerning it. I. That the penitent is in no way released from the obligation by a plenary indulgence: this is probable and safe and is maintained by many weighty doctors. II. That he is so released: this opinion, though unsafe, does not lack proba-

---

[1] "Dilata, et ad mentem Eminentissimi Præfecti quæ est ut præsens causa amplius non proponatur."—Cloquet, Archives de la S. C. des Indulgences, 1862, p. 32.

[2] Bouvier, Traité des Indulgences, p. 30–2.—Jouhanneaud, Dict. des Indulgences, p. 190.

[3] Golden Book of the Confraternities, p. 283.

[4] Palmieri Tract de Pœnit. p. 477.

bility, and is defended by many theologians. III. That a distinction is to be drawn between vindictive and medicinal penance, of which the first is discharged by a plenary and the second is not: this is the most probable opinion, and can be safely followed, while all agree that penance must be imposed in the sacrament.[1] It would not appear that seven hundred years of continuous debate has brought the question to a settlement.

[1] Mig. Sanchez Exposit. Bullæ S. Cruciatæ, pp. 117–8.

CHAPTER III.

DEVELOPMENT.

Two causes have been at work to induce the assignment of an unduly early date to the introduction and development of indulgences. On the one hand, there has been the natural desire to justify the Tridentine assertion of their origin in the remotest times, and, on the other, there is the material furnished for this by the incurable tendency of unscrupulous ecclesiastics to manufacture evidences in support of any claims which interest may lead them to advance. We shall have ample opportunity to consider this latter feature hereafter, and need here only review its earlier and less skilful manifestations.

The desire to find evidence of the use of indulgences in the primitive Church has led to the exhaustive scrutiny of all writings and documents from the apostolic period to the early middle ages, with the object of discovering facts or expressions which may be interpreted in favor of the foregone conclusion. Partly these have been alluded to (p. 5) in describing the various theories evolved by recent authors, and their value may be estimated by the curious list of early indulgences printed by Dr. Amort, who seems to imagine that any imposition of penance infers an indulgence.[1] The appeals of penitents to Rome for a mitigation of canonical penance—of which cases have been incidentally alluded to above, and which at times became an evil energetically protested against by the local prelates[2]—have also been cited to show the supreme papal power of indulgence, although they were only the current exercise of the episcopal and sacerdotal discretion to modify the canonical penalties, which was not indulgence, although the original indulgences developed from it.[3]

---

[1] Amort de Indulgent. I. 28 sqq.

[2] C. Salegunstad. ann. 1022 Cap. 18.—Ivon. Decreti P. xv. Cap. 184.—C. Lemovicens. ann. 1032 Sess. i. (Harduin. VI. ii. 890).

[3] See, for instance, the case of Eriath, which has been quoted as an instance of Papal indulgence. In 867 he is sent back by Nicholas I. to Archbishop

Considerable stress moreover has been laid on a letter of John VIII., in 879, replying to the question of the Frankish bishops as to whether those who fell in battle against the pagan Northmen could obtain pardon for their sins.[1] The papal assurance, that so far as was right he absolved and commended them prayerfully to the Lord, cannot by any stretch of interpretation be regarded as an indulgence, for the question involved is salvation and not the temporal pains of purgatory. Somewhat more germane to the subject is a passage in a Roman Sacramentary, conjectured by Mabillon to belong to the ninth century, which has been triumphantly cited since its discovery as the earliest example of a genuine indulgence. It says that the vigil of the feast of the 1480 martyrs (June 22) is to be celebrated in silence and fasting, and for this one day a year of penance will be remitted.[2] This is simply an instance of the commutations and redemptions habitual under the Penitentials (Vol. II. p. 150), and is instructive as illustrating the mode in which that element of indulgences developed itself. Another case upon which much stress has been laid is that of Solomon Bishop of Constance, about 916, who, finding himself the unwilling cause of three malefactors being put to death, granted them "indulgentiam" before their execution and gave them Christian burial; then, going to Rome, he prayed the pope to grant him penance and "indulgentiam," which was accordingly done.[3] This is a simple case of reconciliation and the removal of irregularity, and its citation as an indulgence is only explicable by the confusion arising from the technical significance attached after the eleventh century to the word *indulgentia*, which originally was

Hincmar with directions to subject him to twelve years' penance for presbytericide, during which, at the end of five years, he is to be readmitted to communion (Nich. PP. I. Epist. 119). It is evident at a glance how little this has in common with a modern indulgence, which can only be granted to a man in a state of grace.

[1] Johann. PP. VIII. Epist. 186.—"Quantum fas est absolvimus precibusque illos Domino commendamus."

[2] "Mense Junio die XXII. sanctorum martyrum mille CCCCLXXX. quorum vigilia cum silentio et jejunio est celebranda: et concessum est eis pro illo uno die annum dimittere in pœnitentia."—Mabillon Musæum Italicum, T. I. P. I. p. 67. Cf. Palmieri Tract. de Pœnit. p. 456; Papebrochii Catal. Pontiff. Diss. XXIX. § 8.

[3] Ekkehardi Junior. de Casibus S. Galli Cap. 1 (Goldast. Rer. Alamann. Scriptt. I. 19). Cf. Mabillon Præf. in Sæc. V. Ord. S. Bened. Cap. 109.

used in the general sense of pardon. Somewhat similar is another case frequently cited—that of St. Ulric of Augsburg, who, about 970, towards the close of his life, made a pilgrimage to Rome to save his soul, whence, after performing his vows, his biographer tells us that he returned with many gifts of emoluments and indulgences—the word here evidently having the meaning of privileges.[1] Equally futile is the effort to discover an indulgence in the benediction pronounced, in 1032, by the Archbishop of Bourges, at the close of the first session of the council of Limoges, when he invoked for those present the blessing of God and prayed that he would concede to them pardon for their sins.[2] These are all the historic cases that I have found adduced as evidence of the existence of indulgences prior to the eleventh century, and their character is such as to prove the contrary of that which they are alleged to support.

With regard to the fabulous and more or less fraudulent early indulgences, we may postpone for more convenient discussion hereafter the tablets in the Roman churches claiming concessions from the time of Sylvester I. downwards. Setting these aside, the earliest would appear to be one of ten and twelve years, said to have been granted in the middle of the sixth century to St. Patrick and the Irish, the spurious character of which is generally acknowledged.[3] Next in order is an indulgence of seven years and seven quarantines, granted by Gregory the Great to those visiting the Roman churches. This is confidently asserted by the schoolmen of the thirteenth century, who were echoed by Boniface VIII. when making grants to the churches, and it has been persistently repeated since, in spite of the protests of orthodox scholars, such as Fathers Papenbroek and Pagi, the former of whom expresses his wonder that such men as Baronius and Bellarmine should give it credence. It probably arose from a passage in John the Deacon, who relates that Gregory was the first to regulate the "stations" of the Roman basilicas by preaching in them twenty homilies at various times. He says nothing of indulgences or pardons or any other graces, which of course were unknown at the period. The *Liber Diurnus*, or formulary for the

---

[1] Gerardi Vit. S. Udalrici August. Cap. 21 (Migne, CXXXV. 1042). Cf. Mabillon *loc. cit.*

[2] C. Lemovicens. ann. 1032 Sess. I. (Harduin. VI. I. 875). Cf. Chr. Lupi Dissert. de Indulg. Cap. 5.

[3] Amort de Indulg. I. 41.

use of the papal scribes up to at least the eighth century, in its collection of formulas for the restoration, building, rebuilding and dedication of churches, the collocation of relics and the privileges of monasteries and other pious foundations, has naturally nothing in the nature of a concession of indulgences.[1] Next to St. Gregory comes a letter ascribed to St. Ludger of Münster, describing a visit paid by Leo III. to Charlemagne, in 803, when he consecrated many churches, chapels and altars, endowing them with indulgences and granting special ones to the church of Werden, where he canonized St. Swibert. The fraudulent character of this document has been sufficiently demonstrated by Father Morin, who shows that it must have been composed at least three centuries later than the time of St. Ludger.[2] Baronius, also, on the strength of a tablet exhibited in the church of SS. Sylvester and Martin, accepts an indulgence of three years and three quarantines, asserted to have been granted by Sergius II., in 847, but the comparatively recent origin of the tablet is shown by both Papenbroek and Pagi. The church, in fact, was in the hands of Greek monks till, in 1294, it was handed over to the Carmelites, perhaps the least scrupulous in such matters of all the orders.[3] The chapel of S. Mary of Einsiedlen at Constance boasts of an indulgence granted, in 964, by Leo VIII., which, as it is *a culpa et pœna* for all contrite and confessed visiting the chapel, must be of fifteenth century manufacture.[4]

---

[1] Papebrochii Catalog. Pontiff. Diss. XXIX. §§ 10, 15.—Pagi Critica ann. 847 n. 4.—Jo. Diaconi Vit. S. Greg. Mag. Lib. II. Cap. xviii.—Lib. Diurn. Roman. Pontiff. Cap. V. VII. (Hoffmann, Nova Collectio Scriptor. T. II.).

Yet Palmieri (Tract. de Indulg. pp. 453–55) endeavors to prove the truth of the legend and declares it to be most probable.

[2] Baron. Annal. ann. 804 n. 2.—Morin. de Pœnit. Lib. X. Cap. XX.—Papebrochii loc. cit. n. 7.

[3] Baron. Annal. ann. 847 n. 4.—Papebrochii loc. cit. n. 1–6.—Pagi Critica ann. 847 n. 4.

Yet Palmieri (Tract. de Pœnit. p. 456) argues that even if the tablet is of late date, it only records the early tradition of what Sergius did, and this in face of the fact that Papenbroek had shown that the inscription consists of a passage from Anastasius Bibliothecarius, a contemporary of Sergius (De Vitis Rom. Pontif. sub Sergio II.), with the addition of five lines containing the indulgence.

[4] "Et nos confisi Omnipotentis Dei gratia et authoritate cunctos prædictum locum confessos et contritos devote visitantes a culpa et a pœna reddimus absolutos"—Gobelini Personæ Cosmodrom. Æt. VI. Cap. 50 (Meibom. Rer. Ger-

It is easy to understand the motive which led the priests and monks thus to speculate on the ignorance of a barbarous period. It was an age of universal greed. Everything was for sale. Altars as sources of revenue are constantly specified as gifts to abbeys and pious foundations; they were bought and sold, granted as investitures, transmitted by inheritance or by acquiring reversions to them, nor, may we presume, were many bishops emulous of the example set by Ratherius of Verona, who, in 964, made over to his priests the offerings at the altar of his church of St. Peter's.[1] About 1070 Alexander II. addressed a terrible letter to the clergy of his former see of Lucca, deploring the venality which turned everything into money and the rapacity which left nothing for the poor and the fabric of the churches, even exacting a vile tribute from the dead.[2] When this was the reigning spirit of the time it is easy to understand the eagerness with which were sought attractions that would bring worshippers to a church. We have seen (Vol. II. p. 130), the money

---

man. Scriptt. I. 254). The phrase was probably borrowed from an indulgence distributed by a *Quæstuarius* of Boniface IX. The bull of Leo VIII. is printed in full as genuine in an official account of the monastery in 1712 (La Cella di S. Meinrado, Einsiedlen, 1712, pp. 25-31), and this preposterous document is claimed to have been confirmed by Nicholas IV. in 1291, Urban VI. in 1387, John XXIII. in 1410, Martin V. in 1426, Eugenius IV. in 1432, Nicholas V. in 1452, Pius II. in 1463 and 1464, Julius II. in 1512, Leo X. in 1518, Pius IV. in 1562, Gregory XIII. in 1573, Clement VIII. in 1597 and Urban VIII. in 1626 (Ib. pp. 106–7). Very likely the confirmations of Pius II. and his successors are genuine, and the indulgence is therefore valid, in spite of the fact that Leo VIII. is reckoned as an antipope (Baron. Annal. ann. 863 n. 31 sqq.).

[1] C. Remens. ann. 1049 Cap. 2; C. Belvacens. ann. 1114 Cap. 17 (Gousset, Actes etc. II. 68, 182).—Spicilegium Vaticanum I. 9 (Romæ, 1890). Quite suggestive as to this matter is a charter of Alexander II., in 1065, to the monastery of St. Peter at Perugia, in which he provides that no future bishop shall seize the oblations nor have the right to celebrate mass there except twice a year on the invitation of the abbot, and then neither he nor his clerks shall take any of the oblations against the will of the abbot and the brethren. —Alex. PP. II. Epist. 26 (Migne, CXLVI. 1305).

[2] "Toto enim mentis adnisu undecunque possunt corradere pecuniam student, ut quæ prius evacuerant possint redimplere marsupia; cujus aviditate impulsi sacris non parcunt altaribus, sed veluti fures et sacrilegi profanas eis manus injiciunt, pauperibus et ecclesiarum fabricis decimas et oblationes juste et canonice competentes more prædonum diripiunt, a mortuis etiam, quasi fisci exactores, importunis clamoribus tributa exigunt."—Alexand. PP. II. Epist. 105 (Migne, CXLVI. 1388–90).

value in this sense of relics and the strife which frequently broke out over the proceeds. Another phase of the same struggle is illustrated by the complaint, about 1170, of the monks of St. Martial of Limoges to Alexander III., representing that, by a rule established by St. Martial himself, all the inhabitants of the bishopric were required annually to visit both the cathedral and the abbey, but that recently the bishop had changed this to an annual visit to his parish church by every parishioner. The good monks object to this, not on account of any presumable damage to the souls of the faithful, but solely because they are thus deprived of the oblations. Alexander considered the grievance reasonable and promptly ordered the bishop to restore the old rules. In a similar spirit, Raoul, Abbot of Fécamp, in 1193, represented that in Normandy an old custom existed that on Pentecost one representative of every household should join in procession to the parish church or pay one *denier;* some of his parishioners, he said, refused to observe it, and Calixtus III. ordered it to be enforced.[1]

An indulgence, therefore, attainable by a visit to a church on stated feast-days was a valuable possession, increasing in value according to the number of feasts and amount of remission of penance. If it contained a clause requiring the payment of money—or, in diplomatic phrase, stretching forth a helping hand—so much the better, and, best of all, if the payment sufficed without the visit, for then it could be peddled around by pardoners, who could work throughout the year, and carry their holy wares to the homes of their customers. These favors to churches were granted with extreme caution at first, and the temptation was irresistible for those unable to obtain them to manufacture them, taking care to place the date of the pretended grant at a period sufficiently distant to render detection difficult. Quite a number of these fraudulent indulgences have come down to us, purporting to have been issued in the eleventh century, some of which have been eagerly cited by modern writers as evidences of the antiquity of indulgences, but, as a rule, their spuriousness can be recognized by comparison with genuine ones of a somewhat later date, for they bear the ear-marks of the subsequent periods when the treasure of the Church began to be lavishly distributed. We have seen, in fact (p. 56), in the second half of the eleventh century, how vague and uncertain were as yet the notions as to these

[1] Löwenfeld Epistt. Pontiff. Roman. ined. pp. 142, 251.

remissions of sin, and we are justified in rejecting all diplomas bearing earlier dates, while reflecting the views and practice of the twelfth and thirteenth and even later centuries.[1]

One of the earliest, probably, of these forgeries seems to be framed in imitation of the curiously indefinite promises by Gregory VII. of absolution *a culpa et pœna*. It purports to be a grant, in 1008, from Bruno, Bishop of Langres, to the monastery of St. Benigne of Dijon, reciting that Abbot William had requested of him some privilege that would assist in defraying the expense of lamps and candles, wherefore he orders that all residing within six leagues of St. Benigne shall, instead of coming to Langres on Rogation days, go to St. Benigne, where, asking pardon of their sins, they shall receive absolution and benediction from the monks, whose tongues are the keys of heaven. Informal as this is, it is yet an evident forgery, for bishops had not yet recognized that priests and monks had the power of the keys, and Bishop Bruno was the last person thus to sell salvation for the lighting of a church. The only work of his which has come down to us is a long and earnest exhortation to his young clerks, setting forth that the kingdom of God is to be won by good works—visiting the sick, aiding the needy, consoling the wretched, etc., conjoined with sincere and humble confession and amendment.[2]

The next in order is one which has been frequently cited in evidence by modern writers. It is an evident interpolation in a charter of privileges presented for confirmation, and is of early date, illustrating how the commutations of the Penitentials were utilized in its construction. It purports to be a grant by Pons de Marignan, Archbishop of Arles, confirmed by Raimbaud de Reillane, his successor, to the abbey of Montmajour on the occasion of his dedi-

---

[1] A single incident will illustrate the unscrupulous audacity with which ecclesiastics manufactured evidence to support whatever privileges they desired to claim. When, in 1051, Leo IX. in making a visitation came to Subiaco—a monastery which he characterized as "caput omnium monasteriorum in Italia constitutorum"—the abbot Attone fled from before his face and died in exile. He caused all the charters to be brought to him and pronounced the greater part of them to be forgeries, ordering them to be burnt before his eyes —Chron. Sublacens. (Muratori, S. R. I. T. XXIV. p. 932).

[2] Chron. Besuense (D'Achery II. 414).—Brunonis Epist. ad Clericos Lingonens. (Migne, CXXXIX. 1537–8).

cation, in 1019, of an underground chapel of a church then building in honor of the Virgin. It provides that all who will give or send an "adjutorium," or gift, ranging from two deniers to twelve, on the anniversary of the dedication, shall have a remission for a year of a third part of their penance, with the suspension during that period of excommunication and disabilities. When the penance is for one day's fast per week it is commuted into feeding three paupers. If the penitent dies during the year he is assured of pardon for his sins. There are further details of no special significance, except that the privilege is declared good for all other churches that may at any future time be erected at Montmajour.[1] I am inclined to think that this may be an amplification of a grant made, in 1065, by Archbishop Raimbaud to the church of the Trinity, St. Mary, St. John, and St. Peter at Correns, which is apparently genuine, as it does not provide for an annual indulgence, but is limited to the simple dedication and consecration of the church, and therefore there would be no motive in its subsequent manufacture. It is much simpler in form, while manifesting the same crude and imperfect idea of what subsequently was considered to be an indulgence; it promises, moreover, that whoever shall enter the church to make a gift shall obtain all he asks, and it enters into a labored explanation of the power of St. Peter to authorize such grants, showing how unfamiliar as yet to the popular mind were such concessions of "absolution."[2]

A much more recent and audacious forgery is one purporting to be granted, in 1029, by Benedict VIII. to the Benedictine nunnery of Neuburg (Augsburg), as it reflects a period when indulgences had grown larger, though at no time would one like this have been granted. It confers a remission of fifty *carinas* and three years of penance for mortals and six years for venials on all who shall visit

[1] D'Achery Spicileg. III. 383 Cf. Mabillon Præf. in Sæc. V. Ord. S. Bened. n. 111; Jouhanneaud, Dict. des Indulgences, p. 115; Gröne, Der Ablass, p. 70.

Not content with this, the good monks of Montmajour framed another of somewhat similar import, which they dated in 844 and ascribed to Sergius II.—Pflugk-Harttung Acta Pontiff. Roman. ined. I. 5.

A similar one dated early in the eleventh century is described as granted by Geoffroi, Archbishop of Narbonne, to the church of Maguelonne.—Chr. Lupi Dissert. de Indulgentiis Cap. 4.

[2] D'Achery Spicileg. III. 402.

the church on any of thirty-eight enumerated feasts and their octaves, and on all Saturdays and Sundays and festivals, or who shall at any time attend divine service, or any funerals or anniversaries of the dead, or shall follow the sacrament or chrism to the sick, or shall give or bequeath any vestments, books, chalices, gold, silver, or other article—and all this is *toties quoties*—as often as the act may be repeated.[1] An evident forgery is one which the church of St. Victor of Marseilles claimed to have obtained from Benedict IX. in 1040. This provides that any one who shall confess his sins to the priests of that church and mend his ways shall be absolved of all his sins; nothing is said as to penance, and even Benedict IX. can scarce be suspected of thus abrogating the canonical penances which, as we have seen, were at this time strictly enforced or were redeemed at a heavy price.[2] In 1060 Nicholas II. visited with his cardinals the abbey of Farfa and dedicated there some altars, when he is said to have given to those present an indulgence of three years, and granted that it should be obtained by all who, on the anniversary, should visit the church with gifts, but the Chronicle of Farfa makes no such statement, and in the charter of protection issued on this occasion to the abbey there is no mention of any such privilege, nor, as we shall see hereafter, were such prolonged indulgences issued to churches for some centuries later.[3] The Chronicle of Monte Cassino states that when Alexander II., in 1065,

[1] Pflugk-Harttung Acta Pontiff. Roman. ined. III. n. 7. Pflugk-Harttung regards this as doubtful, in consequence of a blunder in the date and indiction. Its contents sufficiently prove it to be spurious.

[2] Mabillon Præf. in V. Sæc. Ord. S. Bened. n. 109.

Gröne (Der Ablass, p. 71) cites a letter of indulgence granted, in 1044, by Bruno, Bishop of Minden, to the church of St. Maurice of forty days and a quarantine (!) for visiting it on any one of eleven feasts. As far as can be judged from his version it is a formula of the thirteenth century. He refers for it to "Die Mindener Chronik." Now Lerbeke's *Chronicon Episcc. Mindensium* (Leibnitii Scriptt. Brunsvicens. II. 171) gives a detailed account of Bruno's founding the monastery of St. Maurice, but says nothing of any indulgence. There are only two other chronicles of Minden—the *Chronicon Mindense*, which is merely a condensation of Lerbeke (Meibomii Rer. German I. 560), and Lerbeke's *Chronicon Comitum Schawenburgens.* (Meibom. I. 457), neither of which allude to it.

[3] Papebrochii Catal. Pontiff. Diss. XXIX. n. 8.—Amort. de Indulg. II. 50.—Jouhanneaud, Dict. des Indulgences, p. 118.—Chron. Farfense (Muratori S. R. I. II. II.).—Nicholai PP. II. Epist. 23 (Migne, CXLIII. 1345).

dedicated the church there he granted absolution of their sins to all present and to those who for eight days should visit the church. If this was an indulgence, it was one *a culpa et pœna*, even looser than that which, in 1063 (p. 55), he granted for fighting the Saracens. In such case it was only for that occasion, for there is no mention of it in a charter from him to the venerable monastery, in 1067, when he confirmed its old privileges and granted new ones.[1] There is a vague statement that, in 1070, at the dedication of the church of Lucca, he granted that for eight days on its anniversary there should be "indulgentia pœnitentiæ," but no term is stated, and it was probably a small fraction, as we shall presently see at Angers.[2] It is possible that this may be genuine, for about this period a custom was springing up of granting remissions of penance on the occasion of the dedication of churches and their anniversaries, but for a long while to come it was very sparingly exercised. Evidently fraudulent is a grant to William, Count of Toulouse, attributed to Urban II., in 1088, in which he grants for a cemetery, which the count constructed adjoining the church of Nôtre Dame of Toulouse, that all who should be buried in it should be absolved from the bonds of all their sins.[3] A more notorious example is the indulgence said to have been granted by Urban II., in 1092, when he dedicated the church of the monastery of Cava, near Salernum, which, in spite of its self-evident spuriousness, is still cited as genuine by modern writers. Of this there are two recensions: one grants to all visiting the church on the anniversary of the dedication and the following day and on

[1] Chron. Cassinens. Lib. III. Cap. xxxi.—De Gestis Desiderii Abbat. Cassinens. (Migne, CXLIX. 91).—Alex. PP. II. Epist. 49 (Migne, CXLVI. 1326).—A bull of Alexander's, issued on the occasion of the dedication, anathematizing those who encroached on the abbatial possessions, has a clause granting forty days' indulgence for the anniversary (Chron. Cassinens. Ed. Dubrueil, p. 761), which has every appearance of being an unskilful interpolation.

[2] Papebrochii Catal. Pontiff. Diss. XXIX. n. 8. Among the diplomas of Alexander II. there are several charters to the church of Lucca, but none alluding to this.

[3] Pflugk-Harttung Acta Pontiff. ined. III. n. 7. We may couple with this the assertion of Arnaud de Verdala, Bishop of Maguelonne (died in 1352), that when, in 1096, Urban II. visited Maguelonne, he consecrated the whole island and granted absolution from all sins to all who were buried or should thereafter be buried there.—A. de Verdala Series Episcopp. Magalonens. (D. Bouquet, XII. 371).

Holy Thursday and Friday, the same indulgences as for a pilgrimage to Compostella; the other, not content with this, adds a plenary to the Compostella indulgences and extends the time of visitation throughout the octave of Easter and the feasts of the Virgin; both grant for all other days four years and four quarantines, and to two chapels, dedicated at the same time by the Bishops of Segni and Reggio, seven years and seven quarantines. There is, moreover, a discrepancy in dates, one being XVIII. Kal. Oct., the other the nones of September, and still a third one of IX. Kal. Sept. The absurd largeness of the grant at once destroys its claim to genuineness, and the fraud becomes evident in the reference to the indulgences of Compostella, which, as Papenbroek long since pointed out, had no indulgences until the time of Calixtus II., more than thirty years later.[1] But perhaps the most picturesque fraud of all is one perpetrated for the glory of the Belmosto family of Genoa. It is a bull of Urban II., dated in his sixth year (1094), reciting that to reward Jacopo and Ottobono Belmosto for coming with three hundred retainers to the succor of the Holy See, he grants them the Holy Land indulgence and also plenary indulgence and absolution for all confessed sins committed by them from the hour of birth till that of death.[2]

The manufacture of these documents continued without intermission, but their assumed dates concern us no longer here. At last, in this bog of falsification, we reach firm ground with the dedication by Urban II., February 10, 1096, of the church of St. Nicholas at Angers, when he granted a perpetual indulgence for the anniversary. Hildebert of Le Mans, in a sermon delivered there, mentions the fact, and explains to the people that it was only good for sins repented and confessed, and that it was a custom of the fathers thus to grant pardon of sins on these occasions and on the subsequent annual feasts, but we learn from another source that the pardon thus heralded was in this instance only for one-seventh of enjoined penance.[3] This indicates what is probably the origin of indulgences

[1] Harduin. VI. II. 1638-9.—Chron. Cavense (Ughelli Italia Sacra VIII. 514).—Urbani PP. II. Epist. 84 (Migne, CLI. 365).—Jaffé Regest. n. 4100 (Ed. 1851).—Papebrochii Catal. Pontiff. Dissert. XXIX. n. 9.—Jouhanneaud, Dict. des Indulgences, p. 118.—Gröne, Der Ablass, p. 70.

[2] Pflugk-Harttung Acta, II. 188.

[3] Hildeberti Cenomanensis Serm. 87 (Migne, CLXXI. 749-51).—Hist. Andegavens. Frag. (D'Achery, III. 234).

granted to churches—the desire to signalize the occasion of their dedication and to attract a multitude whose oblations should aid in defraying the cost of the fabric, but the favor was very sparingly bestowed, and the custom was by no means so old as Hildebert would lead us to believe. There is ample evidence to prove this, and it explains the sceptical attitude assumed above with regard to the so-called indulgences of the eleventh century. It would not be easy to imagine a case more provocative of an indulgence, had such been customary, than that of the visit of Leo IX., in 1049, when he came from Germany to France, against the earnest remonstrances of Henry I., at the request of Hérimar, Abbot of S. Remi, to dedicate the latter's abbatial church, where the body of the Apostle of France lay entombed. Leo translated the remains with his own hands to a splendid sepulchre, but in the bull which he issued on the occasion, granting special privileges to the church, there is no hint of an indulgence, although the altar which he had consecrated is especially alluded to and careful restrictions are imposed as to those allowed to minister at it. Nor when, soon afterwards, he ordered a special feast of the translation to be held in the church of Reims did he grant an indulgence to increase its attractiveness.[1] In 1060 Nicholas II. dedicated the basilica of San Lorenzo, and granted it a charter confirming its possessions and taking it under special papal protection, but he said nothing about an indulgence.[2] When, in 1088, Urban II. consecrated the church of St. Mary of Monte Cassino and enriched it with privileges, there is no mention of an indulgence, and it was the same when, in the following year, on the occasion of the translation of the relics of St. Nicholas, he bestowed various privileges on the see of Bari.[3] There is, in fact, a significant illustration of the doubt which as yet the popes felt as to their own powers, and the chaotic condition in which was still the whole subject of the pardon of sin, in a curious deprecatory absolution offered by Gregory VI. in 1044. He recites that the Holy See has been despoiled, the city devastated, and the churches of St. Peter and St. Paul are threatening to fall in ruins. Two centuries later, in these straits, he would have proclaimed an indulgence for sale, but in place of this he appealed

[1] Gousset, Actes etc. II. 69.—Harduin. VI. I. 1010.
[2] Nicholai PP. II. Epist. 17 (Migne, CXLIII. 1334).
[3] Harduin. VI. II. 1627, 1631.

to the faithful for funds, and on meeting a generous response he promises for himself and his successors that thrice a year the names of the donors shall be recited in the mass in all Roman churches, so that, through the merits of the Virgin, the authority of Peter and of Paul and the prayers of the saints reposing in Rome, God may absolve them from all sins and lead them to eternal life.[1] The bishops were even less forward than the popes in the exercise of whatever faculty they may have deemed themselves to possess. In the extensive province of Reims, with its archbishop and eleven suffragans, the offer of indulgences seems to have been unknown until the last quarter of the twelfth century. The pious care of Cardinal Gousset has collected a large mass of diplomas and charters, ranging in date from 1062 to 1175, representing all the occasions ordinarily furnishing excuse for the concession of indulgences—the dedication of churches, the consecration of altars, the assembling of the people for the induction of bishops, the founding of abbeys, the erection of hospitals, the establishment of confraternities—and in none of them does it appear that a single prelate had recourse to this device for kindling the zeal of the faithful and coining it into money to relieve the necessities of the poor or to aid in the fabric of the buildings which were rising on every hand. It is not until 1176 that William of Reims, finding that the fair established for the benefit of lepers by his predecessor Henry, in 1160, was not sufficiently productive, offered to all who should attend it a relaxation of enjoined penance, consisting of one year in seven, of one quarantine in three, and a fourth part of Friday fastings.[2] The cartulary of Nôtre Dame of Paris tells the same story. There are no allusions in it to indulgences, though it contains repeated papal privileges and confirmations from 984 to 1165.[3]

Compostella, though not quite so backward, had no indulgences until the twelfth century was well advanced. We have a minute and detailed account of the long episcopate and archiepiscopate of Diego Gelmirez, who went to Rome, in 1100, for ordination and in 1102 for his pallium, written by his admiring contemporaries Bishop Munio and Canon Gerard, with numerous papal letters specifying and confirming the privileges of the see, but there is no word in

[1] D'Achery Spicileg. III. 398. [2] Gousset, Actes etc. II. 74–313.
[3] Cartularium Ecclesiæ Parisiensis I. 23–7, 220, 227.

them about indulgences, though already, as we have seen (Vol. II. p. 127), the pilgrims thither were numerous enough to obstruct the roads. We hear of the churches and chapels which Gelmirez built, the altars he consecrated, and his reconstruction of his cathedral, burnt in 1117, but there is no indication that such a thing as an indulgence was thought of.[1] The first allusion to any local indulgence occurs in 1124, and then it is granted by a council to enforce the Truce of God; anyone who infringes it is to be attacked by his bishop, and this is regarded as a holy war, in which those who die are assured of the pardon of all confessed sins, as though on a crusade to Jerusalem, while any one who, in observing the truce, is slain by his enemies is granted the same absolution. The next year a council resolves on a foray against the Moors and orders all who join it to confess their sins, after which they are promised, on the authority of God, of the apostles Peter, Paul, and James and all other saints, absolution for all sins committed since baptism, provided they do not leave the army without permission The same is granted to those who send armed foot or horse according to their means.[2] While thus the idea of indulgences had penetrated to Compostella, there is no trace of any such remissions accorded for pilgrimages to the shrine of Santiago. Apparently it was not needed to attract them thither, nor are there any documents to show when they originated, but probably, as rival shrines began to offer such attractions, and pilgrims expected them, the archbishops granted what were requisite. Be this as it may, we find that, in 1198, Innocent III., when urging the authorities of Languedoc to extirpate the heretics, offered for the good work the same indulgences as those earned by pilgrimage to Rome or Compostella, showing that by that time the two apostolic cities were on an equality in this respect.[3]

[1] Historiæ Compostellanæ Lib. I. Cap. 6–22; Lib. II. Cap. 25, 55; Lib. III. Cap. 36.

[2] Ibid. Lib. II. Cap. 71, 78.

[3] Innocent. PP. III. Regest. I. 94. Yet Bianchi (Foriero dell' Anno Santo, p. 47) assumes that Urban II. regulated the indulgences of Compostella, and the learned Christian Wolff (De Indulgentiis Cap. 5) is obliged to recur to the *Chansons de Geste* for their origin, suggesting that they were conferred by Bishop Turpin of Reims, who accompanied Charlemagne in his so-called conquest of Spain.

The good clerics of Compostella were not unskilled in the art of forgery, as appears by the celebrated *Votos de Santiago*, an impost which they claimed on

With the twelfth century indulgences may be considered to have fairly commenced and to be recognized as part of the resources of the Church to further its purposes and to stimulate eleemosynary devotion. Still, with the exception of the plenaries for the Holy Land, they were used with extreme moderation for a prolonged period, as may be seen from a few examples of grants to some of the more venerable institutions. The revered abbey of Cluny, the mother-house of the great Cluniac Order, which exercised so powerful an influence during the eleventh and twelfth centuries, was specially connected with the Holy See. Urban II. consecrated the high altar; Innocent II., in 1132, dedicated the monastery, and in terms which show how great was the favor bestowed, he granted an indulgence of forty days for the anniversary of the ceremony.[1] In 1145 Eugenius III., at the special request of Bishop Atto, granted an indulgence of seven days to his cathedral of Pistoja, which had recently received from Diego Gelmirez of Compostella the priceless gift of a joint from the neck of Santiago, attracting crowds of the blind and halt and infirm, seeking and finding a cure.[2] Alexander III. was equally sparing. April 21, 1163, he dedicated the church of S. Germain des Prés, and though he bestowed an indulgence of a year on the occasion and until the octave of Pentecost, he limited to twenty days that for the future anniversaries.[3] When, in 1177, he made his tri-

---

all the corn and wine produced in Spain, granted by the victorious army of Ramiro II. after the supposititious victory said to have been won at Clavijo in 844, over Abderahman of Córdoba, by the aid of St. James. Copies of the original grant, papal bulls confirming it and other documents were produced whenever wanted, and, though often contested, it was not fully exposed till near the end of the eighteenth century.—Mariana, Historia de España, Lib. VII. Cap. xiii.—Godoy Alcántara, Historia Crítica de los falsos Cronicones, pp. 322 sqq. (Madrid, 1868).—Razon del Juicio contra varios Falsificadores de escrituras públicas etc. pp. 14-107 (Madrid, 1781).—España Sagrada XIX. 329.—Historia Compostellana Lib. III. Cap. 22.—Roderici Toletani de Reb. Hispan. Lib. IV. Cap. xiii.

The tribute was merged into the crown revenues and continued to be paid until 1835, at which time it produced about $1,000,000 a year.—Burke, History of Spain, I. 146 (London, 1895).

[1] Innocent. PP. II. Epist. 89 (Migne, CLXXIX. 127).

[2] Eugen. PP. III. Epist. 47 (Migne, CLXXX. 1063).—Ughelli Italia Sacra, III. 365 (Ed. 1647).

[3] Lowenfeld Epistt. Pontiff. Roman. p. 133.—In 1196 this was confirmed by Cœlestin III. (Ibid. p. 262). Alexander's grant is prefaced with an argumen-

umphant visit to Venice to receive the submission of Frederic Barbarossa, he dedicated the church of S. Maria de Careta, granting twenty days for the anniversary, and two years later he conceded the same for the dedication feast of the church of San Salvatore of the same city.[1] The development of the sacramental theory and the distinction established between *culpa* and *pœna* seem to have brought with them a sense of responsibility which precluded the vague and comprehensive grants of the earlier time. When, about 1125, Honorius II. held the assembly of Capua to stimulate a war with Roger of Sicily he confidently remitted all their sins to those who should fall in it, provided they had undertaken penance. In strong contrast with this is a letter from Alexander III. to the Lombard prelates, reciting how the noble P., in the war with Frederic Barbarossa, had been concerned in the destruction of four castles, over two thousand houses and many men, and now seeks reconciliation; there is no word about an indulgence, but it is pointed out that he should not be chilled in the service of the church, through devotion to which he had committed these sins, and therefore he should be mercifully dealt with while being relieved of all fear as to his salvation—the significance of all which is enhanced by its being carried into the canon law as a precedent to be followed.[2]

This sparing use of indulgences continued long. Lucius III., in 1182, desired to give special recognition to the devotion manifested to him before his elevation by the church of S. Salvatore of Venice; he had dedicated the altar of St. Thomas there, and he now grants an indulgence of eight days to those who on the feast of the saint will come there to worship.[3] It was probably as a political concession to royalty that, in 1208, Innocent III. gave the very unusual indulgence of one year and forty days to Westminster Abbey for

---

tative introduction proving his authority, as though indulgences were still a novelty.

[1] Muratori Antiq. Diss. LXVIII. (T. XIV. p. 109).—Alex. P. III. Epist. 1427 (Migne, T. CC. p. 1242). In significant contrast to this is a forged grant by him, in 1177, to the church of St. Mark, of a plenary indulgence to all visiting it on the feast of St. Mark and contributing to the fabric—Jaffé, Regesta, p. 951 (Literæ spuriæ).

[2] Baronii Annal. ann. 1127 n. 5.—Cap. 3 Extra Lib. v. Tit. xxxviii.

[3] Pflugk-Harttung Acta Pontiff. T. III. p. 409.

those visiting it on the feast of St. Edward the Confessor.[1] This was in no way a precedent for such lavishness, for, in 1215, when he sent to the royal abbey of St. Denis the relics of St. Denis, brought from Greece, and told the monks that this set at rest the question whether they had the body of S. Denis the Areopagite, for now they had both Denises, he only granted forty days of indulgence to those who should come to venerate the saint.[2] Honorius III. was even more sparing, for, in 1221 and 1222, we find him granting ten days for contributing to the restoration of the church of St. Augustin of Canterbury and twenty days for aiding the construction of Château Pelerin by the Templars.[3] He was slightly more liberal when, in 1226, Bernhard, Bishop of Paderborn, solicited an indulgence for his church, and he granted it forty days,[4] and when, in 1217, with a splendid company of cardinals, he dedicated the church of the abbey of Casamaria, which he had built at his own expense before reaching the papacy, he granted a year for the anniversary.[5] In 1243, Innocent IV. granted only twenty days for St. Augustin of Canterbury on the feast of Peter and Paul, and, in 1245, the church of Bethlehem, which we have seen (p. 74) claiming and enjoying a plenary *a culpa et pœna*, was glad to obtain from him one of forty days, which it proceeded to sell throughout Europe by means of *quæstuarii*.[6]

[1] Rymer Fœdera, T. I. p. 150. It is not likely that this is a forgery, though Mr. Bliss does not seem to have found it in the Registers of Innocent III. (Bliss, Calendar of Papal Registers relating to Great Britain, Vol. I. p. 31). He gives, however (p. 262), one of a year granted, in 1250, to those who should contribute to the building of the church of wonderful beauty which the king was then erecting at Westminster in honor of some drops of Christ's blood which the Templars had brought from Palestine for him. On the occasion, in 1247, of depositing this precious relic in the church, Henry III. had carried it with his own hands on foot over the mile of rough and muddy road between St. Paul's and Westminster. The bishops assembled for the solemnity granted an indulgence, to all who should come to venerate it, of six years and a hundred and forty days, which, as we shall see, was a wholly illegal and invalid concession.—Matt. Paris Hist. Angl. ann. 1247.

[2] Innoc. PP. III. Regist. Suppl. n. 201.

[3] Bliss, Calendar of Papal Registers, I. 80, 88.

[4] Gobelini Personæ Cosmodrom. Æt. VI Cap. 67 (Meibom. Rer. German. I. 282). This sufficiently shows the fraudulent character of the plenary which Gröne (Der Ablass, p. 71) says was granted to the cathedral of Paderborn by Alexander III.

[5] Baron. Annal. ann. 1030, n. 23-5.

[6] Berger, Registres d'Innocent IV., n. 132, 980.

About the same period there are numerous bulls obtained by the powerful Franciscan and Dominican orders for assisting to build or visiting their churches, and they seem to be quite content with twenty or forty days.[1] Forty days likewise, in 1244, is considered sufficient for the church of the recently canonized St. Elizabeth at Marburg.[2] The same indulgence was granted to those who would stretch forth helping hands to the unfinished cathedral of Lyons, but the work proceeded slowly, and, as Lyons at the time was a city of refuge for Innocent, he was induced with all his cardinals to dedicate the high altar and to increase the remission to a year.[3] In 1257 a list of the indulgences enjoyed by the great abbey of St. Alban's shows eight in all, granted by various popes, legates, and bishops, ranging from forty days to a year and forty days.[4] Even more impressive, as showing how long this moderation was observed for such institutions, while the popes were lavishing the treasure in other directions, is the list of the celebrated abbey of Mont S. Michael-au-péril-de-la-mer, a noted resort for pilgrims. In 1255 Alexander IV. grants a hundred days for the Resurrection and a hundred for Ascension; John XXII. grants forty for the intervening days and adds a hundred for Ascension. For Pentecost and its octave Alexander offers a hundred, which John doubles for the feast and adds forty for the octave. Late in the fourteenth century Urban V. grants a year and forty days for various feasts, and in the middle of the fifteenth a legate of Nicholas V. offers the same for visiting the church and

---

[1] Sbaraleæ Bullar. Franciscan. I. 451, 466.—Ripoll. Bullar. Ord. Prædic. I. 181, 183, 185, 233.

But when Innocent IV., in 1251, dedicated the church of St. Dominic at Bologna he offered two years and two quarantines for the occasion and the following fifteen days.—Ripoll. I. 200.

[2] Raynald. Annal. ann. 1244 n. 48.

[3] Raynald. Annal. ann. 1247 n. 85.—Berger, Registres d'Innocent IV., T. I. n. 2568–9.

In 1251 the officials of the cathedral endeavored to stimulate popular zeal by an exposition of the relics of SS. Nicetus, Anemund, Denis, and Photinus, and Innocent kindly aided their efforts by granting forty days for visiting the church on the feasts of those saints and during their octaves.—Berger, T. III. n. 5606. Soon afterwards he granted the same to the monastery of St. Mary in Scutere (Strassburg) for Assumption and the feast of dedication.—Ibid. n. 5451.

[4] Matt. Paris. Hist. Angl. Ed. 1644, Auctarium Additament. p. 151.

contributing to its repair, and so forth.[1] Nicholas IV. was in some degree an exception, and set an early example of liberality. His grants to English churches alone, ranging from a hundred days to a year and forty days, amounted to three in March, 1290, three in June, six in August, one in September, seven in October, four in November, and one in December. During 1291 we find eleven in January, one in February, twelve in March, six in April, nine in May, twelve in June, eleven in July, eight in August, fourteen in September, two in November, and two in December. In 1292, January commences with five and February follows with six.[2] Presumably other lands were equally favored, and had not his death, April 4, 1292, put an end to this flourishing industry, which was doubtless profitable to the papal camera, probably scarce a church or chapel in Christendom would have lacked this attraction for devotees. We have seen (p. 63) the thoughtless liberality of the unworldly Cœlestin V. and the prompt action of Boniface VIII. to revoke his acts, for Boniface was much more sparing in his administration of the treasure, save in his supreme invention of the jubilee, of which more hereafter. His registers show no such masses of indulgences as those of Nicholas IV., though we find him occasionally granting a year and forty days to some favored church, such as that of St. Vincent of Valentina, of the Clares of Clermont, or St. Mary of Rocca Priore. He indicates, however, the tendency to vulgarize the pardons in granting that, whenever the Count and Countess of St. Pol shall be present at a sermon, the preacher shall be empowered to bestow an indulgence of forty days, presumably on all present.[3] His usual grants, however, are of forty or a hundred days. Clement V. gave a very marked instance of moderation when, in 1305, his creator, Philippe le Bel, was building a church in honor of his grandfather, St. Louis, and obtained from Clement only an indulgence of forty days for those who should visit it on the feast of St. Louis and during the octave,[4] and when the Augustinian canons of Pavia, who claimed to have the body of St. Augustin in their church, desired an indulgence, he gave only forty days for the feast of the

[1] Amort de Indulgent. I. 192.

[2] Bliss, Calendar of Papal Registers, I. 512, 513–4, 516, 518, 520–4, 526, 529–45, 547–50, 556.

[3] Digard, Registres de Boniface VIII., T. II., n. 2567, 2690, 2695, 3203.

[4] Raynald. Annal. ann. 1305 n. 14.

saint.[1] In 1306 the great church of St. Paul's in London received only a year and forty days for the feast of St. Paul and a hundred days for the octave; in 1313 only a hundred days are offered for aid in building the cathedral of Tuam, and when, in 1320, that of Hereford was rebuilt, only sixty days were promised to those who stretched forth a helping hand—a reward which was increased, in 1329, to a hundred days in the case of the repairs to the cathedral of Cashel.[2] John XXII. evidently was not disposed to laxity, and when he desired to encourage the Tartar converts who were ill-treated by their infidel neighbors, he gave but twenty days each time that they suffered for the faith, though he promised the same for genuflexions in honor of Christ and the Virgin.[3]

But perhaps the most striking evidence of the moderation with which at first the power to concede indulgences was exercised is exhibited in the matter of the canonization of saints. The first exercise of this papal function was in 993, in the case of St. Ulric of Augsburg, by John XV. The pope evidently expected some dissatisfaction with his assumption of the power, for he threatens with the anathema those who should oppose it and invoked on those who accepted it the divine blessing leading to eternal life.[4] In time the formula became an injunction to celebrate the feast of the saint, so that through his merits and intercession due rewards or the pardon of sin might be obtained. This sufficed for great saints, such as St. Bernard, in 1164, and St. Thomas of Canterbury, in 1173.[5] It was not until 1225 that the device was adopted of honoring the saint and benefitting the church which held his remains by offering an indulgence to those who should visit his tomb on his feast-day, and the first to whom it was applied was St. Lawrence O'Toole, Archbishop of Dublin, who had died and was buried in the church of St. Mary at Eu. At the instance of the Archbishop of Rouen he was canonized by Honorius III., and a remission of twenty days' penance was offered to devotees visiting his tomb on his feast, No-

---

[1] Amort de Indulgent. I. 132.

[2] Bliss, Calendar of Papal Registers, II. 17, 109, 196, 290.

[3] Raynald. Annal. ann. 1321 n. 4.

[4] Johann. PP. XV. Bull. *Cum conventus* §§ 3, 4 (Bullar. I. 23).

[5] Alex. PP. III. Bull. *Contigit* § 3, 1164; Bull. *Redolet* § 2, 1173 (Bullar. I. 41).

vember 14, and during the octave.[1] This innovation was not immediately followed. When, in 1228, Gregory IX. canonized St. Francis of Assisi he recurred to the old formula, urging the faithful to celebrate his feast on October 4, so that through his merits they might be admitted to his company in heaven.[2] For this parsimony however Gregory made amends in 1230, when the remains of the humble Francis were translated to the magnificent church built for him by Brother Elias, for to those who should be present at the ceremony or visit the church up to the Nativity of the Virgin, he offered three years' indulgence if they came from beyond seas, two years if from beyond the Alps, and one year for Italians, while for the anniversary and during its octave he granted one year.[3] Having thus broken the ice he grew more liberal. At the canonization of St. Anthony of Padua, in 1233, he granted a year for visiting the tomb on the anniversary or during the octave, and the same for St. Dominic, in 1234. He increased this, in 1235, to a year and forty days for St. Elizabeth, while for St. Peter Martyr, who was regarded with veneration so intense, Innocent IV., in 1253, gave the same, but reduced to forty days the indulgence for the fortnight after the anniversary.[4] The year and forty days remained the standard during the rest of the century, as is seen in the cases of St. Stanislas of Cracow in 1254, St. Clara in 1255, St. Richard of Chichester in 1262, and St. Louis of France in 1297.[5] The increasing liberality of the fourteenth century is exhibited by John XXII. granting two years and two quarantines in the cases of St. Louis of Toulouse, in 1317, and of St. Thomas of Hereford, in 1320, and it is not easy to divine his reason for reducing St. Thomas Aquinas, in 1323, to the old standard of a year and forty days, nor why Clement VI., in canonizing St. Ivo of Treguier, should have omitted all allusion to indulgences and even the old formula respecting his intercession.[6] This was not a

[1] Honor. PP. III. Bull. *Ineffabilis* § 12 (Bullar. I. 70).—Bliss, Calendar of Papal Registers, I. 103.

[2] Gregor. PP. IX. Bull. *Mira* § 9 (Bullar. I. 73).

[3] Ejusd. Bull. *Mirificans* (Sbaralea, I. 65).

[4] Ejusd. Bull. *Quoties a nobis* § 6; Bull. *Fons sapientiæ* § 6; Bull. *Gloriosus* § 6.—Innoc. PP. IV. Bull. *Magnis* § 11 (Bullar. I. 74, 78, 79, 95).

[5] Innoc. PP. IV. Bull. *Olim* § 8.—Alex. PP. IV. Bull. *Clara claris* § 11.—Urbani PP. IV. Bull. *Exultet* § 18.—Bonif. PP. VIII. Bull. *Gloria* § 35 (Bullar. I. 100, 109, 126, 178).

[6] Johann. PP. XXII. Bull. *Sol oriens* § 31; Bull. *Unigenitus* § 25; Bull. *Re-*

precedent, and we shall see hereafter the subsequent growth of canonization indulgences, though they have not developed as extravagantly as those for other purposes.

The principal source of the evolution of indulgences is to be looked for in the crusades. We have seen the vague and informal promises made, in the eleventh century, to stimulate expeditions against the Saracens and war with those whom the Holy See chose to regard as its enemies. Those vague promises seem to have had little influence, but when Urban II. at Clermont placed the matter in the more tangible shape of commutation of all penance, the result was so tremendous that the device became habitually employed on all similar occasions and unquestionably did much to stimulate the crusading spirit of the next two centuries. Its success against the infidel naturally led to its adoption against the enemies of the Church, although at first it seems to have been felt that so great a reward as a plenary should only be offered against the Saracens. When the third Lateran council, in 1179, ordered a crusade against the Cathari of Languedoc, although those who fell were promised salvation, those who served and survived were rewarded with only two years' remission of penance, unless prolonged service should induce the bishops to increase it.[1] This reticence soon wore off, and when, in 1208, Innocent III. commenced the Albigensian crusades he had no scruple in promising full Holy Land indulgences for the service, which in practice reduced itself to the feudal term of forty days.[2] The success which attended this showed how formidable a weapon was thus placed in the hands of the Holy See, whether for the cause of the faith or the furtherance of its political and territorial aggrandizement, and there was no scruple in employ-

demptionem § 23.—Clement. PP. VI. Bull. *Ad spiritualis* (Bullar. I. 193, 200, 204, 257).

[1] C. Lateran. III. ann. 1179, Cap. 27 (Harduin. VI. II. 1684). Cf. Odonis Paris. Episc. Constit. 43 (Ibid. p. 1945).

[2] Innoc. PP. III. Regest. Lib. VII. n. 76, 79, 212; X. n. 149; XI. n. 26, 158, 215. After the capture of Carcassonne, "Major autem pars fidelium facta quadragesima ad sua rediit, minor autem cum comite de Monteforti remansit.—Reinerii Leod. Chron. ann. 1210 (Bouquet, XVIII. 622).

Guillen de Tudela alludes to the forty days' service (Croisade, v. 1266–7)—

> Lai fan la carantena tuit aicel que i son,
> Que cant li uni venon e li autre sen vaont.

ing it everywhere, not only against avowed heretics, such as those of Bosnia, and pretended heretics like the Stedingers and those persecuted in Germany by Conrad of Marburg, but against those whose heresy was merely implied by reason of their disobedience to the papal commands. It made no difference whether the questions involved were of European magnitude, such as those underlying the struggle with Frederic II., Conrad IV., Ezzelin da Romano and Manfred of Sicily, or whether they were petty efforts to extend the patrimony of St. Peter, such as the war of Clement V. with Ferrara and the squabbles of John XXII. with Osimo and Recanati, or personal quarrels, such as that of Boniface VIII. with the Colonnas—they were all holy wars, for which men and means were to be provided out of the spiritual treasure of the Church. In 1241, indeed, Gregory IX. declared that the interests of the Holy See were much more important than those of the Holy Land.[1] When, in 1255, the crusade against Manfred was preached in England, the people marvelled greatly to learn that indulgences could be had for shedding Christian blood as great as for that of the infidel,[2] but this ignorance was soon enlightened. The indulgence which aroused the antagonism of Wickliffe was issued by Urban VI. for a year's service against the rival pope Clement VII. and his French supporters.[3] The one which excited Huss was promised by John XXIII. for a month's participation in his war with Ladislas of Naples.[4] It was not, moreover, only when the direct interests of the Holy See were involved that it had recourse to this means of recruiting its armies and replenishing its treasury. If its policy at any time favored one of the parties to a quarrel it had no scruple in proclaiming a holy war, and Christians were excited to mutual butchery as the means of obtaining pardon of sins. As Henry III. of England was a vassal of the papacy, the rebels under Simon de Montfort were heretics against whom, in 1264, the legate Guy Bishop of Sabina was directed

---

[1] Pertz, Monumenta, Epistt. Sæc. XIII. T. I. p. 707.

[2] Matt. Paris. Hist. Angl. ann. 1255 (Ed. 1644, p. 614) "Quod cum audirent fideles mirabantur quod tantum eis promitteret pro sanguine Christianorum effudendo quantum pro cruore infidelium eliquando."

[3] Raynaldi Annal. ann. 1378, n. 29.—Lechler's John Wiclif and his Precursors, II. 212.

[4] Joh. Huss Monumenta I. 171.

by Urban IV. to preach a crusade.[1] To revenge the conquest of Sicily by Pedro III. of Aragon, Martin IV. gave Aragon to a son of Philippe le Hardi and stimulated him to undertake the conquest of that kingdom as a crusade—an enterprise which cost the unlucky monarch his life.[2] When John of Gaunt sought to vindicate the claim of his wife Constance, daughter of Pedro the Cruel, to the crown of Castile, the papal policy of the Great Schism clothed the raid with the character of a crusade, and Urban VI. granted Holy Land indulgences to his soldiery.[3]

There can be no question of the enormous influence on the popular mind of these promises of pardon which for centuries filled the ranks of those who fought for the Church and brought an unending stream of gold to the papal treasure. As the poet of the Albigensian crusades sings—

> Donc se crozan en Fransa et per tot lo regnat
> Can sabo que seran dels pecat pardonat.[4]

It is impossible, within our limits, to enter into an enumeration of the multitudinous calls to arms, from Portugal to Palestine, and from Sicily to Livonia, which followed each other at short intervals from the year 1100 to 1500. It would scarce be too much to say that, during nearly the whole of those four centuries, there was probably not a year, save those of jubilees, when the cross was not preached in some part of Europe, or *quæstuarii* were not busy in collecting from the faithful sums ostensibly to be devoted to the war against the infidel or the so-called heretics.

In fact, during the latter three centuries the function of the crusading indulgence was rather to raise money than men. If penance could be commuted into a vow to fight the infidel, there was no reason why a further commutation should not release from the vow on the payment of an adequate sum to be devoted to the object of the vow. This thrifty conception would seem not to have been reached until the close of the twelfth century. The first

[1] Bliss, Calendar of Papal Registers, I. 398. On the other hand, Bishop Grosseteste imposed on de Montfort the taking up of arms in remission of his sins.—Matt. Paris. Hist. Angl. ann. 1265 (Ed. 1644, p. 672).

[2] Gesta Philippi III. ann. 1283 (Bouquet, XX. 524).—Raynaldi Annal. ann. 1284 n. 35).

[3] Raynald. ann. 1383 n. 7, 8.

[4] Guillen de Tudela, Croisade contre les Albigeois, v. 166-7

approach to it appears to be in 1184, when a papal legate, after consultation with the bishops of Normandy, offers to all who will pay a prescribed "alms" for the benefit of the Holy Land, an indulgence of three years for those subjected to over seven years' penance, and of two years for those whose penance is less, including all forgotten and venial sins; to disguise this sale of pardon with the semblance of spiritual work, three Paternosters were imposed in addition, and it was proclaimed that those too poor to give the alms could obtain it with the prayers. Then Henry II. and Philip Augustus conferred as to the alms, and assessed it at a payment for three years of about one per cent. of the real and personal property of the penitent.[1] This action is important, for, in so far as I have observed, it was the first step in a process which has continued to the present day. The precedent was followed, in 1195, by Cœlestin III., who, in offering, through his legate, Hubert of Canterbury, a plenary to crusaders, added that those who should contribute would obtain a pardon according to the discretion of their bishops.[2] As yet, however, the fruitful idea of releasing for money unwilling crusaders seems not to have been formed. In 1195 Eudes of Paris orders his priests to excommunicate those who have taken the cross and laid it aside, and, in 1196, Hubert of Canterbury reports to Cœlestin that many who have assumed the cross withdraw from it, while others, through sickness, poverty, or other cause, are unable to fulfil their vow. He asks for instructions in these cases, to which Cœlestin replies that those able to go must be compelled by excommunication; those who are sick must send substitutes to serve for a year or more; if an impediment is temporary, as soon as it is removed the crusader must depart.[3] Evidently there was no thought of permitting local prelates to release unwilling champions of the cross for money.

Yet already the sale of exemptions from the vow was commencing in Rome. In 1200 Hubert applies to Innocent III. to know what he is to do with those who return from there with letters of release bearing the unknown seals of cardinals, to which Innocent replies

---

[1] Harduin. VI. II. 1882.

[2] Cœlest. PP. III. Epist. 224 (Migne, CCVI. 1107).—Matt. Paris Hist. Angl. ann. 1195 (Ed. 1644, p. 126).

[3] Odon. Episc. Paris. Constit. 43 (Harduin. VI. II. 1945).—Cœlest. PP. III. Epist. 238 (Migne, CCVI. 1135).

that when he issues such letters he first makes inquiry of those who know the parties, so that he may determine what is best for their souls and the welfare of the Holy Land; if such letters bear the impress of fraud they are to be disregarded. In response to further inquiries as to the sick and poor who have taken the cross, Innocent replies with a very practical view of the situation. Such persons will be a hindrance rather than a help in Palestine; when there is a temporary impediment delay may be granted for its removal; when it is permanent, the parties must be required to redeem the vow, taking into consideration their wealth and the expenses to which they would be exposed. A distinction is drawn between those voluntarily assuming the cross and those on whom it has been imposed as penance. With the former, if able to go but unfit for fighting, redemption is better than permitting useless expenditure. As for women, those bent on going can accompany their husbands; others, unless rich enough to take fighting men with them, should redeem their vows. The whole matter, however, must be managed by pious and honest men, lest through favor, hatred, or money there be peril to souls and to the Holy Land.[1] As these careful provisions were carried into the canon law they mark the commencement of the policy subsequently adhered to. Innocent, moreover, took a further step when, at the Lateran council of 1216, he offered plenary indulgences to those who should contribute "congruously" of their substance to the assistance of the Holy Land.[2] The practice had gradually been growing of giving partial indulgences for money contributed to what were regarded as pious uses. The plenaries of the crusades had been excepted from this heretofore, but now they too were put into the market to be sold at a constantly diminishing figure, and the whole system of indulgences was rapidly becoming a mere matter of finance. The schoolmen, however, had no difficulty in proving that there was no taint of simony in this. Albertus Magnus argued that the object is not temporal but spiritual, and the Church does not sell but give, while Aquinas fashioned the formula which became traditional—that, although indulgences were given for temporal things, those temporal things were destined for spiritual purposes, such as the destruction of the enemies of the Church, the

[1] Cap. 7, 8, Extra Lib. II. Tit. xxii.

[2] C. Lateran. IV. ann. 1216, *ad calcem* (Harduin. VII. 78).

building of churches, bridges, and the like, and it was merely giving spiritual things for spiritual.[1]

To follow the development of this throughout the thirteenth century would occupy too much space, but its working can be understood by a few incidents. When, in 1226, Louis VIII. undertook to subjugate Languedoc finally, under pretext of a crusade preached by the legate, Cardinal Romano, and he assembled his army at Bourges, a contemporary chronicler gives us a glimpse of the legate surrounded by old men and boys, women and paupers and the infirm, eager to escape from the campaign; he made them swear as to their possessions, of which he took the larger half for the purposes of the crusade and dismissed them to their homes.[2] Some ten years later an English council was inexorable in declaring that all who had taken the cross, of whatever condition or sex, must go, unless so diseased as to render it manifestly impossible; these alone were to be allowed to redeem their vows in proportion to their wealth.[3] This was not the papal policy, for several epistles of Gregory IX. about this time show that money had become a greater object than service; the permission to redeem the vow was no longer limited to the incapable, but was open to all; the proportion of the crusader's property taken was so large that some to escape it hurried off before the sailing of the fleet, which is pronounced an abuse to be checked by excommunication, and apparently there was a brisk trade done in irregular and unlawful absolutions from the vow. When properly settled, the payment was accepted in lieu of the vow and the payer obtained the Holy Land indulgence, the money being divided equally between the Holy See and the Empire of Constantinople, for the succor of which the crusade was preached.[4] In 1241 Gregory reduced this to a system and absorbed the whole, when he directed his legate in Hungary to commute the vows of crusaders for what the expedition and return would cost them, and to remit the proceeds

---

[1] Alberti Magni in IV. Sentt. Dist. xx. Art. 17.—S. Th. Aquin. Summæ Suppl. Q. xxv. Art. iii.

[2] Chron. Turonens. ann. 1226 (Bouquet, XVIII. 314).

[3] Harduin. VII. 313.

[4] Ripoll Bullar. Ord. Prædic. I. 98, 99, 109, 110, 122–4. When Thomas of Cantimpré complains (De Bono Universali Lib. II. Cap. 2) that many were able to redeem their vow with about one per cent. of their revenues, it would seem that much illicit bargaining was practised.

to him to enable him to carry on the war with Frederic II.[1] In a similar spirit the council of Lyons, in 1245, seems more concerned with raising funds than armed forces, and, like its predecessor of Lateran, it promises plenary absolution in return for contributions, without the intermediation of the crusader's vow.[2] All this was thoroughly systematized in England when Innocent IV., in 1247, made over the redemption moneys to Richard of Cornwall for his projected crusade. In every parish throughout the land deputies were appointed to investigate those who had died after assuming the cross and what sums they had left for the crusade, the executors being summoned to pay it promptly. When no such pious bequests had been made the heirs were required to come to an agreement with the friars preaching the crusade, and on payment they received plenary indulgences. The sick and dying were to be warned to assume the cross by their priests and by those engaged in drawing their wills, and both they and all others who had taken it were to declare what they were willing to give for redemption. No one was to be forced, but was to be told that if they gave in accordance with their wealth they should have a plenary, if less, the indulgence was to be proportioned to the degree of devotion thus manifested.[3] This latter was the established rule at the period, as shown in the instructions to the Dominicans preaching the cross in Bohemia against the Prutheni and elsewhere.[4] The liability of heirs was a recognized principle, for when, in 1332, John XXII. published an indulgence in aid of the abortive crusade promised by Philippe de Valois, he provided that, while the heirs of those who had already taken the cross should still be subject to the obligation in case of the death of the testator, those who should take it in future might, within six months, make a declaration before their bishop exonerating their heirs, when if they should die before fulfilling the vow, through no fault of their own, the heirs should be exempt. Otherwise, the heirs were held liable for what their expenses for a year would have been, while a bequest of the same amount made by the dying man gained him the plenary. Those who should die within six months without having made the

[1] Pertz Monumenta, Epistt. Sæc. XIII. p. 707.
[2] C. Lugdunens. ann. 1245, Cap. xvii. (Harduin. VII. 395).
[3] Matt. Paris. Ed. 1644, Auctarium Additament. p. 146.
[4] Ripoll I. 84, 220, 426.

declaration were not entitled to the indulgence, but if they had expended anything they gained a proportionate partial; while those who might die after setting out would obtain the plenary only if the heirs would assume the expense they would have undergone, or send a substitute.[1] It would be difficult to adjust more accurately the "happy commerce" in the treasure of the blood of Christ. When the simpler plan was adopted of soliciting contributions without the intervention of a vow of personal service, Innocent IV., in 1253, prescribed that the full plenary should be given to those who paid at least one-fourth of their annual revenue, while for less amounts the pardon was to be proportionate.[2] To facilitate this, and also presumably to prevent pilfering, when a crusade was preached, whether against the infidel or the turbulent citizens of some petty Italian city, the prelates were ordered to place chests in all parish and collegial churches to receive the offerings of the faithful.[3] That, in all this, money was the main object is manifest in a regulation introduced by Nicholas IV., in 1291, when the fall of Acre enabled him to revive for a moment the fading crusading spirit. Under this the crusader no longer exercised the choice of service or payment, but the delegates of the Holy See decided whether he should fulfil or commute his vow.[4]

The sums derived from this source were large and were freely distributed, if not always wisely. There is extant a letter of the papal Penitentiary which shows that some knights who had taken the cross went to Rome and procured from it an order on the Bishop of Laon to make over to them the expenses of their crusade out of the fund of the redemptions.[5] On a larger scale was the gratuity with which Gregory IX., in 1237, softened his sentence on Amaury de Montfort, whom he required to join the crusade in punishment for his attempt to seize the county of Melgueil, which had fallen to the Holy See as part of the spoils of the Albigensian wars. Gregory ordered the Archbishop of Sens to set apart three thousand silver marcs from the redemptions in Amaury's lands and in the province of Sens, ex-

---

[1] Pez Thesaur. Anecd. VI. III. 23-5. See the Formulary of the Papal Penitentiary, pp. 167-8 (Philadelphia, 1892), for several individual cases involving the redemption of crusading vows.

[2] Ripoll I. 231-2. Cf. pp. 461, 497.

[3] Johann. PP. XXII. Regist. P. IV. n. 75, 97, 99 (Harduin. VII. 1431-33).

[4] Ripoll II. 33.

[5] Formulary of the Papal Penitentiary, p. 167.

cepting the domains of other counts and barons unless the sum could not otherwise be made up. Of this he was to pay Amaury a thousand marcs before his departure and two thousand, by the hands of the Templars, after his arrival in Palestine. Amaury, with his usual ill-luck, was taken prisoner by the Saracens, and, in 1241, we find Gregory ordering five thousand marcs to be paid for his ransom, provided less will not be accepted, the amount to be drawn from the same fund and the legacies for the Holy Land, not otherwise assigned to the Templars, the Hospitallers etc. So, in 1237, Gregory orders the Archbishop of Reims to pay one-tenth of the redemption fund to the Count of Bar, who proposes to lead a hundred knights to the holy war. In 1238 he orders the Bishop of Le Mans to give the whole of the redemption fund to Pierre de Braine, one-third now and two-thirds after his arrival beyond the seas; also his penitentiary is ordered to assign to the Sire de Beaulieu the redemptions collected in his lands and to give to the Bishop of Nevers, who has taken the cross, those of two bishopries not otherwise appropriated. The nobles to whom these assignments were made endeavored to augment the proceeds by compelling crusaders, who were willing to go, to redeem their vows, an abuse which Gregory peremptorily ordered to be checked.[1] In a similar spirit Innocent IV., in 1250, ordered his representatives in France to make over to St. Louis, then engaged in his unfortunate crusade, all the redemption moneys in the kingdom which were not assigned to barons, and, in 1251, he gave to the Teutonic knights, who were in want of arms and horses, the redemptions arising from the commutation of vows for a crusade in Livonia.[2]

Thus gradually the whole business became a mere scheme for raising money under pretext of the holy war against the Infidel, the proceeds in the north of Europe passing into the hands of the

---

[1] Raynald. Annal. ann. 1237, n. 31.—Sbaraleæ Bullar. Francisc. I. 228, 232, 235, 237, 254, 256, 291.—Bliss, Calendar of Papal Registers, I. 193.

[2] Berger, Registres d'Innocent IV. n. 4929.—Ripoll I. 189.—It was not merely crusading vows that were thus utilized. In 1308 Clement V. authorized all the prelates of Europe to commute all vows of maceration and pilgrimage (excepting that to the Holy Land) for money to aid the Knights of St. John in their projected crusade. The commutation for a pilgrimage was to be the amount that it would cost the pilgrim.—Schmidt, Päpstliche Urkunden u. Registen, p. 67 (Halle, 1886).

popes, while in the lands exposed to daily conflict with the Moors they went to the sovereigns who regarded the indulgence simply as a financial expedient. The price of the redemption or contribution gradually fell, so as to bring it within the reach of the whole population, and the sums collected became correspondingly large, rendering it a prolific source of revenue known as the *cruzada* in Spain and *crociata* in Italy. The indulgences continued to be of the fullest character, and there were added to them facilities for the composition of unlawful gains and dispensation for marriage within prohibited degrees and for other irregularities. One of the earliest examples of this form of the cruzada was a concession granted, in 1457, by the Spaniard Calixtus III. to Henry IV. of Castile and Affonso IV. of Portugal. As far, at least, as the former was concerned it was a mere device for raising money, for Henry made no special effort against the Moors. The grant ran for four years and gave indulgence *a culpa et a pœna* for 200 maravedises. After paying all expenses, we are told that he gained by it 100,000,000 maravedises, which would indicate a sale of over half a million of indulgences within the comparatively narrow limit of his dominions. Although major excommunication, removable only by the pope, was threatened for the diversion of the proceeds from the holy war, Henry soon commenced to make lavish grants from the fund to Beltran de la Cueva and other favorites; the sacred cause gained nothing, and although the prelates and the nobles of the other faction held an assembly at Uceda to devise a remedy for this deplorable result, the terrible condition of the royal finances rendered their interposition fruitless.[1] The cruzada became a permanent institution, and long after it was simply a portion of the royal revenues the fiction of its original purpose was still kept up. Even at the end of the sixteenth century, the bull of concession thus provides not only for the trifling payment determined by the Commissioner-General, but for the sending of substitutes to the supposititious crusade; men of high rank are directed to furnish at least ten, or, if this is beyond their power, at least four; others, whether secular or clerical, one, unless they are

[1] Nogueira, Expositio Bullæ Cruciatæ Lusitaniæ concessæ, p. 7.—Francisco de Medina, Vida del Cardenal Pedro Gonzalez de Mendoza (Memorial Histórico Español, T. VI. p. 159).—Barrantes, Illustraciones de la Casa de Niebla, Lib. VII. Cap 18 (Ibid. T. X. p. 169).

so poor that three or four have to club together to send one, while chapters and convents should provide one for every ten members.[1] We shall have occasion hereafter to consider in some detail the working of the system.

Thus far we have been concerned almost exclusively with papal indulgences. Since the Lateran council of 1216 those issued by bishops form in some sort a class by themselves, and, although of much less importance than the former, yet they require some consideration.

Originally, as we have seen (p. 36) there was no distinction between the papal and episcopal functions as regards the concession of indulgences. For a long time, as we have also seen, plenaries were confined to crusades, and the partials granted for other objects were exceedingly moderate in amount. When the interests of the faith were concerned, bishops had no hesitation in promising remission as fully as the pope, though the latter, as the representative of Christendom at large, for the most part monopolized this function. In 1121 Veremund, Patriarch of Jerusalem, in appealing for help, offers plenary pardons for all sins for which penance has been accepted, and this by his own authority, and his example was followed by the bishops assembled in Compostella, in 1024 and 1025, to enforce the Truce of God and stimulate an expedition against the Moors.[2] For the ordinary objects of indulgences bishops imitated the papal moderation, though on occasion they had no scruple in exceeding it. Thus, in 1153, Hugues, Archbishop of Rouen, one of the most learned prelates of the period, at the elevation of the body of S. Gautier de Pontoise, granted out of seven years' penance one year and a third of the remainder; out of fourteen years, two years and a third of the remainder; while to those who had accepted forty years he gave one-half and a third of the remainder. He was more sparing, in 1156, on the occasion of the discovery of the Holy Coat of Argenteuil, although the ceremony was most impressive, being attended by Louis VII. and all his court, with a great gathering of prelates and an innumerable multitude of the people, for he promised to those who should visit the coat during the year only one year's

[1] Rodriguez, Expositione della Bolla della Crociata, p. 37.
[2] Historiæ Compostell. Lib. II. Cap. 28, 71, 78.

remission for mortal sins and half the penance of forgotten and venial ones, while in subsequent years only forty days were granted, and this only on the feast of S. Denis and during its octave.[1] It shows how novel as yet was this exercise of the power of the keys that Abelard fiercely assails the impudence of this episcopal greed, which seeks, whenever there is hope of copious oblations on the occasion of dedicating a church, consecrating an altar or blessing a cemetery, to attract a crowd under pretence of relaxing a third or a fourth part of penance, covering cupidity with a mantle of charity. If, he adds, they have power thus to open and close heaven they would be most fortunate if they could open it for themselves.[2]

The first limitation on this episcopal power was its restriction to the immediate subjects of the grantor. This was defined by Alexander III., in response to an enquiry by the Archbishop of Canterbury, whether the remissions given for the dedications of churches and the building of bridges were valid for those not subjected to the prelate issuing them, to which Alexander replied that no one can be bound or loosed except by his own judge.[3] This was followed, in 1216, by the action of the Lateran council in strictly circumscribing episcopal action. It alluded to the indiscreet and superfluous indulgences granted by some bishops, whereby the keys were exposed to contempt and the satisfaction of penance was enervated, wherefore it was decreed that, at the dedication of churches, no matter how many bishops might be present, the indulgence should not exceed a year, while forty days must be the limit for anniversaries and other objects, and it called attention that this moderation was customarily observed by the popes, although they enjoyed plenitude of power.[4] It was

---

[1] Mabillon Præf. in Sæc. V. Ord. Benedict. n. 112.—Hugon. Rotomagens. Epist. 25 (Migne, CXCII. 1137).

[2] P. Abælardi Ethicar. Cap. 25.

[3] Post Concil. Lateran. P. XXXV. Cap. 4.

[4] C. Lateran. IV. Cap. 62 (Harduin. VII. 66).

I am inclined to think that the slur thus cast upon the bishops was undeserved, though doubtless it was the part of prudence to check the unbridled rivalry which would infallibly have grown up amid a class of men so worldly as the mediæval episcopate, as well as to render the fabrication of excessive indulgences more difficult. I have not been able to find any authentic cases of undue profuseness prior to the Lateran council. Thus, in 1178, the dedication of the monastery of Bec was a very solemn ceremony, performed by Rotrou, Archbishop of Rouen, assisted by the Bishops of Avranches, Evreux and S.

well, perhaps, that there was some authority to control the bishops; unfortunately there was none to control the popes.

This restriction, at the time, might readily be agreed to, because, as we have seen, the limits assigned were fully up to the concessions ordinarily made—concessions quite sufficient to attract penitents and secure the harvest of oblations so long as the competition of more attractive terms was confined to the crusades. Yet the limitation

---

Brieuc, in the presence of Henry II. of England and his son the younger King Henry, yet only forty days' indulgence was granted for the anniversary.—Chron. Beccens. ann. 1178 (Migne, CL. 657). In 1195 we find Cœlestin III. confirming an indulgence granted by Bertrand Bishop of Metz to the church of St. Mary and St. Theobald of forty days of enjoined penance on Easter Monday and the anniversary of the dedication, though in addition forgotten sins and penance were included, and there is a curious allusion to the sins of fathers and mothers not involving restitution, as though sin was heritable.—Cœlestin. PP. III. Epist. 222 (Migne, CCVI. 1106). I have not met with any instances of greater liberality than that of Hugues of Rouen, mentioned above, and in all the Compilations, embracing the papal decretals from Alexander III. to Honorius III., there is no complaint or warning or exhortation to moderation.

Maurice de Sully, who was Bishop of Paris from 1163 to 1196, has been commonly assumed as guilty of much excess in this direction, and I was disposed to believe that he might have given some ground for the animadversions of the Lateran fathers, but I have not been able to discover any positive evidence to that effect. It is true that he was of obscure birth and so poor that, when a student in the University of Paris, he had to resort to beggary, and that during his episcopate he not only built Nôtre Dame, but founded and endowed four abbeys, constructed episcopal palaces and bridges and left his see greatly enriched (Rigord de Gestis Philippi Augusti ann. 1196; Guill. Brito de Gestis Philippi ann. 1196; Guill. de Nangiaco Chron. ann. 1176, 1196; Necrolog. Parisiens. *ap.* Migne, CCV. 895). None of the contemporary chroniclers however accuse him of undue acquisitiveness through indulgences. Cæsarius of Heisterbach (Dialog. Dist. II. Cap. 33) says that he was too zealous in building his cathedral, but the only instance given is his endeavor to obtain for the fabric the conscientious restitutions of a usurer. Peter Cantor, who, in his *Verbum abbreviatum* so unsparingly lashed the vices of the prelates of his day, has no word of reproof for Maurice, or for the reckless use of indulgences. Father Morin, however, does not hesitate to say (De Pœnit. Lib. X. Cap. 20) that Maurice's expenditures were defrayed by the partial and plenary indulgences which he sold, bringing in sums of money which the royal treasury could scarce have supplied, and there evidently was some tradition of the kind, for Victor Martet (Maurice de Sully, p. 109, Paris, 1890), in his defence of Maurice, quotes from Eudes de Châteauroux, in the thirteenth century, the phrase "Ecclesia Parisiensis de obolis mulierum pro magna parte facta est."

was not strictly observed, and there was a perceptible disposition to assert the old privileges of the episcopal order. In 1221 Archbishop Simon of Ravenna, when dedicating the church of the convent of St. Mary, granted in perpetuity for its anniversary and the succeeding fifteen days, an indulgence of three years to those who contributed money.[1] About the same time William of Auxerre complains that bishops promise too much, for a frequent formula is that whoever will give of his substance to the fabric of a certain church will obtain remission of a third of his penance, his forgotten sins, his broken vows, if he resumes them, and the like, when in fact no one can make a just estimate as to forgotten sins and broken vows.[2] This assumes that there is no objection to the remission of a third of the penance, and William of Paris goes further by sturdily maintaining the right of the bishop to grant either partial or plenary indulgences at his discretion, and this either with or without cause.[3] S. Ramon de Peñafort doubtless represents the papal party when he casts doubts on the efficacy of episcopal indulgences and insists that penance should be performed to satisfy the Church, which has been scandalized by the sinner.[4] The same influence is to be traced in the warning given by the council of Lyons to the Archbishop of Reims, who was selling indulgences to build his cathedral, not to exceed the Lateran limits, and the embodiment of this in the canon law shows the determination of the Holy See to insist on its observance. At the same time, in its zeal for the impending crusade, the council conferred on all prelates a special power to grant indulgences at their discretion to those whom they could persuade to make legacies for the Holy Land and the Empire of Constantinople, all moneys thus received to be kept under seal by the bishops.[5] Cardinal Henry of Susa and Albertus Magnus naturally repeat the injunction that the Lateran rule must be enforced,[6] but it was difficult to prevent

[1] Rubei Hist. Ravennat. p. 385 (Venet. 1689).

[2] Guillel. Altisiodor Summæ Lib. IV. Tract. vi. Cap. 9 (Morin de Pœnit. Lib. X. Cap. 21).

[3] Guillel. Parisiens. de Sacram. Ordinis Cap. 13. The good bishop practised what he taught, if Morin is correct (*ubi sup.*) in asserting that he was very profuse in his grants of indulgences.

[4] S. Raymundi Summæ Lib. III. Tit. xxxiv. § 5.

[5] Cap. 1 in Sexto Lib. V. Tit. X.—C. Lugdunens. I. ann. 1245 Cap. 15 (Harduin. VII. 391).

[6] Hostiens. Aureæ Summæ Lib. V. De Remiss. § 5.—Alberti Magni in IV. Sentt. Dist. XX. Art. 21.

infractions. Among the few mediæval indulgences granted for charitable work was one, in 1286, by Archbishop Boniface of Ravenna, who, after taxing his prelates with living splendidly while allowing the poor to starve, granted a year's remission of penance to bishops who would feed four paupers daily, to abbots who would feed two, to archdeacons and archpriests who would feed one, and to other clerics who would feed a pauper once a week. There was no money to be made out of this, and, in 1317, the council of Ravenna awoke to this violation of the rules and cut it down to forty days, while at the same time eluding the rule by granting to its own members and all who had assisted in its labors forty days for every day so employed.[1] Bishops were frequently transgressing, and, about 1300, Boniface VIII. deemed it necessary to decree that episcopal grants exceeding the Lateran limits had no force (*vires non obtinent*).[2] This gave rise to a new question—whether the whole indulgence is invalid or only the excess above the Lateran standard. As to this authorities differed. Astesanus, to reconcile the dispute, reaches the curiously logical conclusion that it ought to be wholly invalid, but is not so.[3] Some even held that the limitation only took effect after the decretal of Boniface and his embodiment of it in the canon law, while there was a lively dispute whether it or the Lateran precept was retroactive in its effect and was applicable to earlier grants.[4] Baptista Tornamala gives the conflicting authorities as to whether the whole indulgence or only the excess is invalid, and evades an answer, while Prierias tells us that the weight of authority inclines to the latter view. Rodriguez asserts positively that it is the excess that is null, and this I presume is the accepted teaching.[5]

There are bishops who are *legati nati*—papal legates *ex officio*—and these claimed that their power of granting indulgences was the same

[1] C. Ravennat. ann. 1286, Rubr. ii.; ann. 1317, Rubr. xx. xxii. (Harduin. VIII. 944, 1447, 1449).

[2] Cap. 3 in Sexto Lib. v. Tit. x. Of course the popes assumed the power of enlarging the episcopal privilege: Thus, in 1296, Boniface VIII. granted to Burchard, Archbishop of Magdeburg, a faculty to concede a year and forty days to all present at his first mass, duly repentant and confessed.—Schmidt, Päbstliche Urkunden u. Regesten, p. 21 (Halle, 1886).

[3] Astesani Summæ Lib. v. Tit. xl. Art. 2, Q. 1.

[4] Weigel Claviculæ Indulgent. Cap. liv.

[5] Summa Rosella s. v. *Indulgentia* §§ 4, 5.—Summa Sylvestrina s. v. *Indulgentia* § 15.—Rodriguez, Bolla della Santa Crociata, p. 12.

as that of legates, which, as we shall see, exceeded somewhat that of bishops. Some of the German prelates came within this category, as also the Archbishops of York, Canterbury, and Reims, and their claims were allowed.[1] The Archbishops of Benevento asserted a right to grant a hundred days under a concession of Clement VI., October 6, 1347, and this was confirmed, in 1747, by Clement XIII.[2]

The forty-day limit for episcopal indulgences is enforced with strictness, in spite of the profusion with which papal plenaries are distributed. In 1847 the Archbishop of Camerino suggested that archbishops could grant eighty days after certain functions, but the Congregation of Indulgences returned a decided negative.[3] This is perhaps explicable by the fact that special indults are, for the most part, readily obtainable, whereby the bishops can exercise extended powers for erecting confraternities with indulgences, of granting faculties for blessing medals, chaplets, images, and the like, of rendering altars privileged—in short, of regulating within their dioceses the patronage connected with pardons.[4] When these are not expressly limited to a term of years, they are, of course, subject to withdrawal at any time, and they form part of the faculties held on a virtual tenor of implicit obedience which enables the Holy See to exercise control over insubordination in the episcopal ranks.

The Church has always benevolently endeavored to ease the terrors of the death-bed, at which time there are no reserved cases, and, as we have seen, any priest can bestow absolution. A similar policy arose as regards indulgences when the Counter-Reformation gradually deprived them of their pecuniary fruitfulness. The popes grew in the habit of granting three years' faculties to bishops to bestow plenary indulgence *in articulo*, but they were limited to this as a personal function, and could not delegate it, except on special occasions when summoned at night and unable to respond to the call. Of course but a very small portion of the faithful could be benefited by this, for there were comparatively few within reach of the bishop and fewer who would venture to summon him, or whose summons

[1] Bianchi, Foriero dell' Anno Santo, p. 205.—Ferraris Prompta Biblioth. s. v. *Legatus*, n. 11.

[2] Viva de Jubilæo et Indulg. p. 88.—Decreta Authentica n. 306.

[3] Decreta Authentica, n. 611.

[4] Bouvier, Traité des Indulgences p. 52.—Decreta Authentica, n. 575, 576, 773.

he would heed. It probably was the terrible pestilence ravaging Lombardy, in 1576 and 1577, which induced Gregory XIII., in 1580, to bestow on the bishops of the province of Milan general authority to delegate this power. In 1656 Alexander VII. conferred on the Congregation of Regular Clerics ministering to the Sick a faculty to grant such indulgences. Apparently the custom spread, and doubts arose whether plenaries ought to be given to all who sought them *in articulo*, but, in 1675, the Congregation of Indulgences decided in the affirmative. In 1710 the Congregation was besought to give the power to Apostolic Vicars and other inferior prelates having independent jurisdiction, but nothing was done. Finally Benedict XIV., in 1747, after reciting the impossibility which he had found as Bishop of Ancona and Archbishop of Bologna to discharge this duty, placed the matter on a more liberal basis. All prelates in charge of independent territory are authorized to apply for and receive letters enabling them to grant plenary indulgence *in articulo*, and to delegate this power to one or more priests in each place within their dioceses. The form of indulgence prescribed is careful to specify that it is in virtue of delegated apostolic authority, and the indulgence is absolute, but Benedict recognized and expressed the danger that this facility of death-bed pardon would become virtually a license to sin, and to guard against this he directed the priests to warn their flocks frequently to bear in mind the uncertainty of the external rite unless the soul is properly prepared for it.[1]

Cardinals have a somewhat larger liberty than bishops, as they can grant indulgences of a hundred days within their own churches, although these grants are not perpetual.[2] Legates have still more extended power. Originally, like bishops, it was limited to forty days,[3] but their capacity has been increased, and it is recognized that for any pious work they can concede what they please within a year, while for churches and chapels the limit is seven years and seven

[1] C. Mediolan. VI. Const. xi. (Harduin. X. 1115).—Decr. Authent. n. 8.—Bened. PP. XIV. Bull. *Pia Mater*, 4 Maii, 1747.

[2] Summa Diana s. v. *Indulgentia* n. 2.—Viva de Jubilæo et Indulg. p. 90.—Ferraris Prompta Bibliotheca s. v. *Indulgentia* Art. II. n. 23.—Varceno Comp. Theol. Moral. Tract. XXIV. Cap. 1.

[3] Durandi Speculi Lib. I. Partic. 1, § 4, n. 39.

quarantines, with the added advantage that these grants may be perpetual.[1] As a matter of course, however, the pope when commissioning them can grant whatever additional powers he sees fit, although, in the earlier period, this was very sparingly exercised. In 1263 Urban IV., in sending Guido, Bishop of Sabina, as legate to England, gave him five special faculties for granting indulgences for various objects, ranging from forty days to a year and forty days, and the latter term is the maximum in several faculties granted to nuncios and legates to England by various popes between 1306 and 1337.[2] On the other hand, in 1307, Clement V., in sending Cardinal Gentile as legate to Poland, Dalmatia, Croatia, etc., furnished him only with power to concede ten, twenty, thirty, or forty days to those contributing to churches.[3] In 1513 Leo X., when conferring unusual powers on the Cardinal of Gran as legate to Poland, authorized him to bestow indulgences of from one to six years; in 1514 the Cardinal of Mantua, as legate in the March of Ancona, was empowered to grant to every one a year's indulgence and a plenary at death, and, in 1518, the legates to England, Cardinals Wolsey and Campeggio, were commissioned to give plenaries whenever they celebrated mass before the king and queen.[4]

A question which has excited a certain amount of debate is whether a general council has power to grant indulgences. The Lateran council of 1216 and that of Lyons in 1245 had no hesitation, as we have seen, in making the customary remissions to crusaders. In 1423 that of Siena assumed, as a matter of course, its authority to offer Holy Land indulgences to all who would capture heretics and deliver them to bishops or inquisitors.[5] All this was no invasion of papal power, for the two former assemblies were presided over by popes and the latter by a legate, but when the council of Bâle, on the eve of its rupture with Eugenius III., in 1435, resolved to issue Holy Land indulgences to raise money to attract the Greek envoys to Bâle, and the papal legates refused to append their signatures, the

[1] Ferraris Prompta Biblioth. s. v. *Legatus*, n. 46.

[2] Bliss, Calendar of Papal Registers, I. 398–99; II. 31, 105, 131, 538.

[3] Regest. Clement. PP. V. Ann. II. n. 2282.

[4] Hergenröther Regesta Leonis X. n. 3688–3703, 8699.—Rymer Fœdera, T. XIII. p. 609.

[5] Harduin. VIII. 1017.

council assumed that it represented the Church universal and proceeded to act independently. It ordered chests to be placed in all churches, and any opposition, even papal, to be repressed with censures, calling in the assistance of the secular arm if necessary. Eugenius protested, but the council persisted, and again, in 1439, it asserted its powers by granting to all its members who had served for six months a plenary once in life and at death, and thus a new point was raised in the acrimonious debate as to the supremacy of pope or council.[1] Weigel, who was himself a commissioner for the sale of the former indulgence, shows how far-reaching were the questions involved. He admits that all prelates derive their jurisdiction from the pope, but a general council as well as a pope can issue indulgences; as an individual the pope, like any other prelate, can err, but a general council, assembled in the Holy Ghost, cannot err, and therefore is it superior to the pope.[2] The miserable failure at Bâle practically settled the question of papal preponderance, and subsequent theologians for the most part, if they admit the power of a general council to issue indulgences, which some do not, qualify it with the definition that a general council is one presided over by the pope or his legates. Domingo Soto and Azpilcueta, however, assert it without this reserve, and Polacchi admits that an "acephalous" council—one held during a papal vacancy—"probably has the power."[3]

We have seen that the bishops did not wholly acquiesce in the restriction placed upon them by the Lateran canon, and that there frequently was little scruple in disregarding it. Several ways of eluding it were moreover discovered. One of these was to grant an indulgence *toties quoties*, when the penitent by frequent repetition

[1] Martene Thesaur. T. IV. p. 375.—Harduin. T. VIII. pp. 1217, 1357, 1302–4.

[2] Weigel Claviculæ Indulgent. Cap. 42–52.

[3] Pauliani de Jobilæo et Indulgent. pp. 126–7 (Romæ, 1550).—Azpilcuetæ Comment. de Jobilæo, Notab. XXXI. n. 2.—Dom. Soto in IV. Sentt. Dist. XXI. Q. 1. Art. 4.—Bellarmini de Indulg. Lib. I. cap. 11.—Polacchi Comment. in Bull. Urbani VIII. pp. 262, 333.—Summa Diana s. v. *Indulgentia* n. 2.—Van Ranst Opusc. de Indulg. p. 59.—Ferraris Prompta Biblioth. s. v. *Indulgentia*, Art ii. n. 4.—Gröne, Der Ablass, p. 45.—Beringer, Die Ablässe, p. 37.—Bouvier, Traité des Indulgences, p. 44.

could enlarge the remission indefinitely. Thus when the church of St. Vulmer was destroyed in 1256, Raoul, Bishop of Térouane, offered sixty days to all who would come, personally or by messenger, with contributions for its restoration, as often as the pious act was repeated, and as no minimum limit was specified for the offerings, the penitent could subdivide his oblation at pleasure. Such indulgences were not uncommon, and their use greatly enlarged the limits of episcopal power.[1]

Another method, largely practised, was that of several prelates combining and cumulating their indulgences. Originally this would seem to have been recognized as strictly permissible. About 1186, on the occasion of the foundation of the abbey of St. Nicholas of Angers, we are told that Urban III. granted a remission of one seventh of penance, to which the Archbishop of Tours, the Bishop of Angers, and all the bishops of Britanny added forty days each.[2] The Lateran canon, as we have seen (p. 163), forbade this cumulation, which, in fact, was unlawful under the ruling of Alexander III. that a bishop's jurisdiction in this field was limited strictly to his own subjects. The question of jurisdiction which was thus imported into the matter, and the connected one of the assent of bishops to each other's indulgences, gave rise to a perplexing and intricate branch of canon law, for every one was desirous of gathering contributions from all sources, and the industry of the *quæstuarii* had little respect for boundary lines. Bishop William Durand thus summarizes the subject towards the end of the thirteenth century. The archiepiscopal jurisdiction in indulgences extends over the whole province, the episcopal is limited to the diocese. If subjects of other sees assist in building a bridge or a hospital in the diocese of Paris, the indulgence granted by the bishop of Paris is worthless to them without the assent of their own bishops. A bishop, in subscribing to the indulgence of another bishop, can say that he concedes to all who may assist the said hospital that they can participate in all the good works performed in his bishopric, and this, according to Vincent, even without the consent of their bishops. The proper form of subscription is "I absolve forty days if it pleases their

[1] Gousset, Actes etc. II., 395, 607.—Statuta Synod. Camerac. (Hartzheim IV. 83).—Pez Thesaur. Anecd. VI. III. 259–61.

[2] Morin. de Pœnit. Lib. X. Cap. 23.

bishops," and then they obtain the remission from him and not from their own bishops, but with the consent of the latter, but it would be safer to obtain in advance the consent of their bishops. Some bishops, misled by Vincent, erroneously concede indulgences for the repair of bridges and churches in other dioceses, adding the clause "if the diocese grants assent." But even such consent is invalid, for no bishop can concede that indulgences issued by other bishops in his diocese are good there, although a bishop can concede that his indulgence may be good for those coming from elsewhere into his diocese, for in this case those coming seem to obtain his jurisdiction, while in the former case he is extending his jurisdiction over those not subject to it. If this were allowed he could indirectly grant indulgences of a hundred years, which is prohibited.[1] It is evident that the subject was confused, and that prelates had little hesitation in presuming upon popular ignorance and in overstepping their legal prerogatives.

It was claimed that an archbishop and a bishop could each grant forty days, and thus an eighty-day indulgence could be had by the subjects of the diocese, while those of the rest of the province only gained the archiepiscopal forty. Even Cardinal Henry of Susa admits this, and he is followed by many authorities, but Stefano Notti assures us that the weight of opinion is in the negative.[2] This however was a much more pardonable infraction of the rule than many others that were habitual. Titular bishops *in partibus*, having no jurisdiction, were incapable of granting valid indulgences, but there always were many of them hanging around the papal court or wandering elsewhere, and ready to turn a penny, honest or otherwise, by any use of their sacred office, nor were the rectors of churches generally much more scrupulous as to the means by which they could attract oblations. Thus, in 1283, we find the monastery of Polling obtaining from a Benedictine who styles himself Leo "Epis-

[1] Durandi Speculi Lib. iv. Partic. iv. De Pœnit. et Remiss. n. 5–8. An example of this irregularity is an indulgence of forty days granted, in 1249, by the Bishop of Valencia to those visiting the church of S. Maria of Calatayud (España Sagrada, XLIX. 428). It specifies the assent of the diocesan of Taragona, but nevertheless, according to Durand's view, it was invalid.

[2] Hostiens. Aureæ Summæ Lib. v. De Remiss. § 5.—Astesani Summæ Lib. v. Tit. xl. Art. 2. Q. 1.—Summa Rosella s. v. *Indulgentia* § 9.—Summa Angelica s. v. *Indulgentia* § 12.—Steph. ex Nottis Opus Remissionis, fol. 154*b*.

copus Chalamonensis," and dates from the office of the vicechancellor at Rome, two indulgences of one hundred and forty days and one of forty, subject to the approval of the bishop of Augsburg, which is duly appended.[1] Even more frequent was the practice of numerous bishops uniting to cumulate their powers. Cardinal Henry of Susa tells us that this was customary, but that in reality the subjects of each bishop only gained the forty days of his own prelate.[2] Yet in spite of the Lateran prohibition there were doctors who, like Pierre de la Palu, argued in favor of the custom, provided the bishop of the locality assented,[3] but Boniface VIII. repeated the restriction, and the theologians as a rule maintained it.[4] Nothing however could prevent the abuse. About the year 1300 the Archbishop of Reims and all his suffragans united in granting an indulgence of 480 days to the benefactors of all poor parish churches, and this was ordered to be diligently explained by all parish priests to their subjects.[5] In 1321 twenty-eight bishops gathered at the council of Valladolid from Aragon, Navarre, Portugal and Castile, united in granting forty days each to those who would contribute to the nunnery of St. Mark in Calatayud, provided the bishop approved, which the diocesan of Taragona promptly did, and added forty days more.[6]

---

[1] Amort de Indulgentiis I. 231. Calamona was a see in Crete, at that time under Venitian domination. Even the industry of Father Gams has apparently not been able to throw any light on an "Episcopus Syringensis," who, in 1324, being in Vienna, granted an indulgence of forty days to the chapel of St. Dorothy (Pez Thesaur. Anecd. VI. III. 10).

In 1359 a wandering bishop of St. Marco (Naples) in Vienna grants forty days to the parochial church of St. Stephen (Ibid. p. 44).

[2] Hostiens. Aureæ Summæ Lib. v. de Remiss. § 5. Albertus Magnus also speaks of it as a common abuse (In IV. Sentt. Dist. XX. Art. 21).

[3] P. de Palude in IV. Sentt. Dist. XX. Q. iv. Art. 2, Concl. 4. John of Freiburg (Summæ Confessor. Lib. III. Tit. xxxiv. Q 189) and Baptista Tornamala (Summa Rosella s. v. *Indulgentia* § 13) suggest that a confessor can authorize his penitent to gain indulgences from any one, and thus episcopal remissions may be cumulated.

[4] Cap. 3 in Sexto Lib. v. Tit. 10.—Astesani Summæ Lib. v. Tit. xl. Art. 2, Q. 5.—Epist. Synodal. Guill. Episc. Cadurcens. Cap. 8 (Martene Thesaur. IV. 689).—Summa Angelica s. v. *Indulgentia* § 5.

[5] Statuta Synodal. Camerac. (Hartzheim IV. 83).

[6] The original of this formed part of the "Exposicion Histórico Europea" held in Madrid, in 1892, and was No. 434 of the Catalogue of Sala X. It is from the archives of Alcalá de Henares.

In 1363 thirteen bishops of three provinces gathered at the council of Lavaur granted forty days each to all who, on any one of more than thirty feast-days and their octaves, would visit the cathedral of Lavaur and contribute to its repair, or, without visiting, would give or leave it anything, and, as though conscious of acting illegally, a claim is made of being a general council.[1] It was however from the bishops collected at Rome that these irregular indulgences were usually procured. In 1290 three archbishops and nine bishops, from various lands, including some *in partibus*, grant forty days each to the chapel of St. Werner—presumably the boy said to have been sacrificed by Jews at Bacharach, who was not canonized till 1421 by Cardinal Branda. In 1287 fifteen bishops contribute forty days each to the cathedral at Narni. In 1329 the Archbishop of Pisa and nine bishops concede forty days each to the Cistercian monastery of the Holy Cross at Vienna.[2] Still greater offenders in this way were the cardinals. As Pierre Dubois says, in 1306, they had little or no revenue from their titular churches, and were obliged, like mercenaries, to live, as it were, by rapine,[3] and the price at which they could sell their signatures to such a document was not to be despised at a time when the concession of indulgences to a church was, as we shall see, as much a matter of traffic as the sale of those indulgences to individual penitents by the *quæstuarii*. It was in vain that, in 1417, Martin V. forbade the issuing of such grants under the seals of the cardinals and decreed that all such should be invalid.[4] The princes of the Church apparently regarded this as a concession to the weakness of the fathers of Constance, intended to be inoperative, for, in 1419, we find twenty-one members of the Sacred College uniting to grant a hundred days each to the church of St. Rasso, and they had numerous imitators.[5] How completely this was a matter of ordinary

[1] C. Vaurense ann. 1363 (Harduin. VII. 1860).

[2] Amort de Indulgentiis I. 226.—Pez Thesaur. Anecd. VI. III. 15. For other instances see Amort, pp. 226, 227, 228, and Pez, VI. II. 171, 194, 201.

The frequency with which this resource was exploited is indicated by the church of the Holy Sepulchre in Calatayud procuring, in 1297, forty days each from fifteen bishops at Orvieto, where the papal court was staying (Archivo de Alcalá) and another, in 1299, of forty days each from ten bishops in Rome (España Sagrada, Tom. 50, p. 453).

[3] De Recuperatione Terræ Sanctæ (Bongars, Gesta Dei per Francos II. 325).

[4] Regulæ Martini PP. V. n. 41 (Ottenthal, 196).

[5] Amort *op. cit.* I. 229–34. I have before me one of these documents, elab-

business reduced to a system is seen by a fifteenth century book of formulas, which states that the issuing of papal indulgences is in the hands of the abbreviators, but for those granted by cardinals it proceeds to give instructions. These commence with the titles of the cardinals, showing their order of precedence, so that the names may

---

orately engrossed on parchment, with the cardinals' seals appended, enclosed in large oval boxes of sheet iron. It reads: "Guillermus episcopus Ostiensis, Alanus Sancte Praxedis, Johannes Sancti Laurentii in Damaso, Angelus Sancte Crucis in Hierusalem, Berardus Sancte Sabine et Bartholomeus Sancti Clementis titulorum presbiteri, miseratione divina sacrosancte ecclesie Cardinales Rothomagensis, Avenionensis, Zamorensis, Reatinus, Spoletanus et Ravennas vulgariter nuncupati, omnibus et singulis christifidelibus presentes nostras litteras inspecturis, salutem in Domino sempiternam. Dum precelsa meritorum insignia quibus regina celorum Virgo dei genetrix gloriosa sedibus prelata sidereis quasi stella matutina prerutilat, devote considerationis indagine perscrutamur, dum eciam intra nostre mentis archana revolvimus quod ipsa utpote mater misericordie et gratie pietatis amica humani generis consolatrix et provigil, ad regem quem genuit intercedit, dignum quinimmo debitum arbitramur ut ecclesias ad honorem sui nominis decoratas gratiosis remissionum prosequamur impendiis et indulgentiarum muneribus. Cupientes igitur ut ecclesia Beatarum Marie et Catherine virginum in Fronperg Ratisponensis diocesis congruis frequentetur honoribus et ut christifideles eo libentius devocionis causa confluant ad eandem, quo ibidem dono celestis gracie uberius conspexerint se refectos, de Omnipotentis dei misericordia ac Beatorum Petri et Pauli apostolorum ejus auctoritate confisi, Omnibus vere penitentibus et confessis qui dictam ecclesiam in singulis Annunciacionis beate Marie virginis, Resurrectionis domini nostri ihesu christi, Assumpcionis gloriosissime virginis matris Marie prefate et Catherine virginis, necnon dedicacionis ipsius ecclesie a primis vesperis usque ad secundas vesperas inclusive festivitatibus devote visitaverint annuatim et ad reparacionem ac conservacionem edificiorum, calicum, librorum et aliorum ornamentorum pro divino cultu inibi necessariorum manus porrexerint adjutrices, Nos Cardinales prefati et quilibet nostrum seorsim pro qualibet die festivitatum et celebritate hujusmodi, Centum dies indulgenciarum de injunctis eis penitentiis misericorditer in domino relaxamus, presentibus perpetuis futuris temporibus duraturis. In quorum omnium et singulorum fidem et testimonium premissorum presentes nostras litteras exinde fieri mandavimus nostrorumque Cardinalatuum maiorim (*sic*) Sigillum jussimus et fecimus appensione communiri. Dat. Rome, anno a Nativitate domini Millesimo quadringentesimo sexagesimo quinto, Indictione terciadecima, die vero Lune Secunda Mensis Decembris, Pontificatus Sanctissimi in christo patris et domini nostri domini Pauli divina providencia Pape Secundi Anno Secundo."

It will be seen by the titles of these prelates that they had not the excuse of poverty for condescending to this traffic.

be arranged in due sequence. Then it gives twenty-three formulas of preambles, for the Trinity, Corpus Christi, Virgin Mary, Holy Cross, St. John the Baptist, St. Michael etc., indicating how purely formal was the effusiveness of these documents. The examples which it proceeds to give are intended for cumulative indulgences, proving that this was the customary form.[1]

In 1500 Stefano Notti shows us that the question was still keenly debated whether prelates could unite and cumulate their indulgences, although it was admitted to be prohibited by the Lateran canon.[2] Prierias and Azpilcueta however allude to no doubt on the subject and assume the limitation to be in force as a matter of course.[3] The principle may be considered settled, but it has been difficult to eradicate the practice. When St. Pius V. refused to renew the *cruzada* in Spain, Philip II., who keenly felt the loss of revenue, after vainly endeavoring to influence the pope, assembled, in 1570, all his bishops, who cumulated their powers so effectively that they proclaimed an indulgence of a hundred years for the simple prayer *Bendita y loada y ensalçada sea nuestra Santa Fé Católica.*[4] So lately as 1838 the question came before the Congregation of Indulgences in the shape of a picture of the Virgin, belonging to a citizen of Marseilles, who had obtained from the bishop an indulgence of forty days for all who would recite certain prayers before it. Not satisfied with this, he procured other similar pardons from bishops passing through the city, and the Congregation was appealed to as to their validity, when it necessarily decided that the first was good and the subsequent ones apocryphal.[5] In spite of this, a book published by the *Libreria Religiosa* of Barcelona, in 1855, bears the announcement that various prelates of Spain have conceded twenty-three hundred and twenty days of indulgence to any one who will read or listen to a chapter or a page of any its publications.[6]

[1] Formularium Instrumentorum ad usum Curiæ Romanæ, fol. 63–5 (Sine nota, sed Memmingæ, v. Hain, 7276).

[2] Steph. ex Nottis Opus Remissionis, fol. 153*b*.

[3] Summa Sylvestrina s. v. *Indulgentia* § 11.—Azpilcuetæ Comment. de Jubilæo, Notab. XXXI. n. 4.

[4] Perez de Lara, Compendio de las tres Gracias, pp. 30–33.

[5] Decreta Authentica n. 499.

[6] As this appears in front of the title-page of so serious a work as Vicente de la Fuente's *Historia eclesiástica de España*, I presume that it must be accepted as genuine.

For the most part the indulgences which have thus far come before us have been those issued for crusading purposes and for aiding in the building, repair, and maintenance of churches and religious houses. Their usefulness, however, was by no means confined to these objects. We have seen how, in the early days (p. 55, 144), they were employed to enforce the Truce of God. Another purpose for which they were largely used was the construction of bridges—an object of the greatest public utility and peculiarly important to the churches as facilitating the access of pilgrims. The building of bridges is classed with the assistance of churches as the motive for indulgences in the inquiry made by the Archbishop of Canterbury of Alexander III., and Robert of Flammesburg couples them together similarly when he has occasion to characterize the indulgences which he proceeds to discuss. S. Ramon de Peñafort, indeed, seems to recognize bridges as the primary object of these partial remissions, and only speaks of them and of the crusades.[1] Popes did not disdain to use their supreme authority for this purpose. In 1188 Clement III. calls upon all the faithful in Sicily, Tuscany, and Genoa to aid the brethren of the Hospital of Stagno, near Pisa, who had undertaken to build a bridge, and he stimulates zeal with a thirty days' indulgence.[2] In 1209 Innocent III. offers an indulgence to all who will lend a helping hand to the completion of the bridge over the Rhone at Lyons.[3] Bridges were, however, not the only

[1] Post Concil. Lateran. P. XXXV. Cap. 4.—R. de Flammesburg. Pœnitent. (Amort, II. 33).—S. Raymundi Summæ Lib. III. Tit. xxxiv. § 5.

Possibly one reason for the selection of bridges as objects for indulgences was that ecclesiastics, at least in some places, were not exempted from contributing to their erection and maintenance. Charlemagne alludes to this as an ancient custom, which he confirms (Martene Ampl. Collect. VII. 10), and this was carried into the Lombard Law (L. Longob. Lothar. I. Cap. 41).

[2] Pflugk-Harttung Acta Pontiff. III. n. 408.

[3] Potthast Regest. n. 3799. The interest felt by ecclesiastics in these enterprises is illustrated by Nivelon, Bishop of Soissons, who accompanied the fourth crusade and was present at the capture of Constantinople. The Emperor Baldwin gave him the relics of St. Stephen the protomartyr, which he carried to the West when, in 1205, he was sent home to solicit succor. At Châlons he gave to the church of St. Stephen an arm-bone, under condition that the oblations of pilgrims visiting it should be equally divided between the fabric of the church and the building of the bridge of the city (Gousset, Actes, II. 337–8). He could not grant an indulgence in a strange diocese, but doubtless the Bishop of Châlons conferred one on so priceless a relic.

public works thus assisted, for William of Paris also alludes to the construction and improvement of roads and pavements as objects for which indulgences were customarily employed.[1]

In fact, these pardons became the current coin with which the Church rewarded the faithful and stimulated zeal in its service, whatever was the object on which it had set its heart. If missionaries were to be sent to distant lands they were given a plenary, and were empowered to grant twenty or forty days to all who would listen to them, and it was the same with those employed to preach the cross and with inquisitors. If those who listened to the latter or assembled to gaze on the victims of an auto-de-fé obtained forty days, the more earnest Catholics who assisted them in the difficult and sometimes dangerous work of tracking and capturing heretics were rewarded with plenaries.[2] When the assassination of St. Peter Martyr was utilized to the utmost, associations of *crocesegnati* were formed throughout Italy to aid the Inquisition, and a plenary was offered to all who would join them.[3] It is not to be wondered at, therefore, if a special indulgence was granted to those who manifested their zeal by bringing wood to add to the pile at the stake[4]—a fact which sufficiently neutralizes the efforts of modern apologists to relieve the Church of the responsibility of these holocausts. When, in 1247, the excommunication of Frederic II. by the council of Lyons was to be published, as it was in some places a service not without danger, those to whom the duty was confided were promised full remission of sins if they should be exposed to insult, violence, or persecution.[5]

[1] Guill. Paris. de Sacramento Ordinis Cap. xiii.

[2] Ripoll Bullar. Ord. Prædic. I. 44, 57, 100, 101, 102, 175, 179, 188, 222, 230, 242, 247, 248, 286, 424, 526; II. 143, 178, 186.—Sbaralea Bullar. Francisc. I. 451.—Raynald. ann. 1252, n. 26.—Innoc. PP. IV. Bull. *Quia tunc* (Bullar. I. 102).

The custom of granting indulgences to those present at the autos-de-fé of the Inquisition was continued to modern times. To this Azpilcueta (De Oratione Cap. v. n. 43) attributes the crowds assembled on such occasions.

[3] Innoc. PP. IV. Bull. *Malitia*, 1254 (Bullar. I. 103).

[4] Formulary of the Papal Penitentiary, p. 60. Yet, with curious inconsistency, clerics who seek to gain this indulgence become "irregular" if the wood they bring actually aids in the burning.—Jac. a Graffiis Decis. Aureæ Casuum Conscient. P. II. Lib. ii. Cap. 19, n. 53.

[5] Ripoll, I. 172.

For the most part, however, the object of indulgences was the purely material one of raising money. This is admitted in the crude advice of William of Auxerre that the penitent seeking an indulgence should have discretion to know for how much he wants to be relieved, or what he wishes to give for absolution from so much penance, while Albertus Magnus, on the other hand, requires the Church to make a just estimate of the payment to be required—that is, according to the necessity of the Church and the wealth of the penitent.[1] The simplicity of this bargain and sale is emphasized by the provision occasionally found in indulgences that the remission gained will be in proportion to the amount of payment and devotion.[2] In all this there was no hypocritical concealment of the object; the moral standard had become so debased that the traffic in the blood of Christ was carried on openly and without shame. Gilles Charlier, in answering the Hussite arguments at the council of Bâle, does not deem it necessary to defend the sale of indulgences, but only to explain that the money is expended for worthy purposes, and makes no allusion to any spiritual objects.[3] When the council struggled with Eugenius IV. to gain the advantage of dealing with the Greeks, both issued indulgences avowedly for the purpose of raising money

---

[1] Guill. Autissiodor. Lib. IV. De Relaxationibus (Amort, II. 61).—Alb. Magni in IV. Sentt. Dist. XX. Art. 17.

[2] For instance, in an indulgence granted by Boniface VIII. to the Hospital of Viterbo (Ripoll, II. 58), and in a crusading indulgence of Clement V. in 1308.—Liber Guillel. Majoris (Mélanges Historiques I. 403-6).—Regest. Clement. PP. V. Ann. III. n. 2989. In this latter the terms are definite—twenty-four years for twenty-four deniers, twelve years for twelve, six years for six, one year for one. Those unable or unwilling to give these sums can have a proportionate remission for a farthing. This is to be continued for five years, but any one can give for all five at once.

The spirit in which the local churches administered this indulgence was worthy of it. At Narbonne the canons of the cathedral cunningly moved the chest for contributions to the repair of the fabric alongside of that for the crusade, so that careless penitents dropped their money into the wrong box and got the inferior indulgence. The falling off in the crusade receipts betrayed the trick, which Clement characterized as a fraud and ordered the chests separated. At Bordeaux the canons behaved even worse, for they contemptuously ejected the papal chest from the cathedral, whereupon Clement commanded its replacement under threat of excommunication.—Regest. Clem. V. Ann. IV. n. 4771, 4923.

[3] Ægid. Carlerii Orat. (Harduin. VIII. 1793).

to defray the expenses of the envoys from Constantinople; the council placed the price of its pardons at one week's outlay of the penitent's family, while the pope more vaguely and more wisely specified only that it should be proportioned to his ability.[1] The spirit in which ecclesiastics themselves regarded this method of raising money is manifested in the protest of the German nation in the council when the issue of the indulgence was proposed. They insisted that if this were done all other indulgences must be suspended; it must be general throughout Europe and be apportioned among the several nations according to their rank in the council; to avoid suspicion of fraud, Germany must have the appointment of all collectors within her borders, and the custody of the money; if the Greeks were not won over, the money must be spent in pious uses in the places where it was raised, as otherwise the people would consider themselves deceived by the clergy. If these conditions were accepted, Germany, although exhausted with the Hussite crusades, would do her duty, but she would not admit that she was in any way under greater obligation than other nations to permit this kind of collection.[2] Evidently, in the fifteenth century, there was no thought of the spiritual benefits which modern moralists so fondly ascribe to the system.

Even more significant is the tone adopted by Matthias Döringk, Franciscan provincial and a man of the highest repute, when, in 1451, the jubilee of 1450 was, as usual, extended over Germany. Chests, he says, were placed in all the churches to receive the money for it, in order to devour what had been left in Germany by those who had gone to Rome. Some, in the vain hope of plenary absolution, while retaining ill-acquired gains, went to the chests. Others, seeing indulgences peddled around for sale, despised them—and also perhaps because they were the evil cause of the pomp and avarice of the Roman curia. Then, in 1455, he describes how, when the Turks besieged Cyprus, the King of Cyprus obtained from Nicholas V. extravagant indulgences to be sold for a year. The Germans concluded that they were of no use, for there were no results from the money collected, and it was said by some that the name of the King of Cyprus was only a cloak for the curia. Then, after an incomputable amount of money had been thus carried off, in 1455, came

[1] Harduin. VIII. 1217; IX. 747. [2] Martene Ampl. Collect. VIII. 798.

the emissaries of the Trinitarians for the redemption of captives, who took what the others had left.[1] These are the complaints of an unfriendly critic, but when Æneas Sylvius undertakes to defend indulgences he does so wholly on the ground of their financial productiveness to carry on the war with the Turks. They are voluntary, he argues, and not imposed—no one need take them unless he chooses. As for the complaints about the suspension of the Cyprus indulgence, they come from German bishops who had made bargains with the commissioners to share their gains and are disappointed at the substitution of the indulgence for the Turkish war, out of which they make nothing.[2] Evidently the souls of the sinners were the last things considered by the rival prelates, who wrangled over the proceeds of the speculation on men's fears of the hereafter.

Stefano Notti argues that indulgences which do not require money payments are liberal, while those which are based on money are just, and he gains most who pays most; moreover, he defends the *toties quoties* remissions on the ground that a payment is made each time, for which the Church obligates itself to pray for the sinner.[3] Prierias, the Master of the Sacred Palace, coolly observes that the pope does not grant indulgences to induce men to go to confession, but to get their alms[4]—the practical comment on which is the absorption by Leo X. of the proceeds of indulgences granted to local churches. Thus, June 3, 1514, the vicar of the Bishop of Xaintes is ordered to surrender all the money collected from an indulgence given to those helping the church of Xaintes, and on June 15 a similar order is given to the vicar of the Archbishop of Reggio with regard to the indulgence of the church of St. Agatha.[5] Even as late as 1550 Pauliano describes the objects of indulgences as purely material—to raise money to fight the infidel or to build bridges, or to help the Church or the poor; when an indulgence depends on a money payment, a Franciscan, forbidden to handle money, can gain it if he can find some one to pay for him, otherwise not.[6]

But it was not only by the sale, through commissioners, of papal

---

[1] Doringii Chron. ann. 1451, 1455 (Menkenii S. Rer. Germ. III. 17, 21).
[2] Æn. Sylvius de Moribus Germaniæ (Opp. Basil. 1571, p. 1049).
[3] Steph. ex Nottis Opus Remissionis, fol. 146*b*, 153*a*.
[4] Summa Sylvestrina s. v. *Indulgentia* § 20.
[5] Hergenröther, Regest. Leon. PP. X. n. 9350, 9694.
[6] Paulianus de Jobilæo et Indulg. pp. 73–4, 182–3 (Romæ, 1550).

indulgences to sinners that the curia reaped its profits from the control of the treasure of Christ's merits. The concessions which were granted so profusely had all to be paid for. When, as we have seen (Vol. I. p. 246), benefices were openly sold at fixed prices, and public opinion was too callous to be shocked at this undisguised simony, it would have seemed an absurd nicety to hesitate at traffic in concessions of pardons. It was merely dealing at wholesale in what the purchaser expected to make his profit by retailing. In 1393 a tax-list of the papal chancery taxes at 100 florins a letter of Boniface IX. granting a jubilee indulgence to the kingdom of Bohemia. This only represents the scrivener's and official fees; what was paid for the grant does not appear, but it unquestionably was a much larger sum, for, in 1394, the city of Cologne sent Dr. Johann von Neuestein to Boniface to negotiate for a jubilee with which to replenish its treasury. The price at first asked was 8000 florins, but he succeeded in beating the curia down to 1000, besides which he paid 100 for the expenses connected with the transaction and 30 for a duplicate copy, while in addition the Holy See retained for itself one-half the proceeds from the sale of the indulgence.[1] In 1412 the Teutonic Grand Master, Heinrich von Plauen, paid 1000 gulden for a plenary indulgence for the chapels of the Order—a price which he deemed extortionate. When, in 1450, Nicholas V. proclaimed his jubilee, the Teutonic Order refused to publish it in its territories, desiring to keep pilgrims and money at home, and asked for a decree whereby the priests of the Order could give the same indulgences. Nicholas was incensed at this, and the Order was obliged to make its peace by a present to him of 1000 ducats. When thus appeased he was again requested to issue the decree, but he merely replied that Cardinal Nicholas of Cusa would be sent to Germany to publish the jubilee, whereupon the Grand Master instructed his agent in Rome not to ask the cardinal to come to Prussia with his indulgence. Subsequently the agent wrote that the terms would be to the penitents one-half the cost of the pilgrimage to Rome and back; each bishop would have to pay for the bull, and, moreover, to hand over to the curia one-half of the proceeds; for the four bishopries of Prussia the price would be 1000 ducats; this he thought too dear and that it

[1] Tangl, Das Taxwesen der päpstlichen Kanzlei, pp. 66, 105 (Mittheilungen des Instituts für österreichische Geschichtsforschung, T. XII.).

would be better to have nothing to do with the indulgence, but to keep the money at home. The Grand Master agreed with him, and the result was that the Cardinal persecuted the German possessions of the Order and that the pope was incensed for years.[1]

When, in 1487, Innocent VIII. desired to redeem his tiara and jewels, which were hypothecated for 100,000 ducats, he created a college of secretaries consisting of twenty-four members, each of whom was obliged to pay 2600 florins for the appointment; in return for this they were granted the fees for the rough drafts of certain classes of writs, among which were included indulgences.[2] What these fees for the rough drafts were we have no means of knowing, but in a tax-table of the Apostolic Chancery, printed about 1500, we find the fees charged for various forms of indulgences—fees which were only a portion of the total cost to the purchaser. A faculty for a preacher to grant remissions of a certain number of days to his auditors is priced at two florins, but if restricted to occasions when the king and queen are present it is only a florin and a half. A plenary *in mortis articulo* for all contributing to the rebuilding of a destroyed monastery or church, running for two years, is five florins, and for each additional year half a florin, or, if perpetual, seven florins and a half. A year's indulgence for a hospital or church or chapel is 16 *grossi*, a two years' 20, a three years' 24, a four years' 30, a five years' 40, a seven years' 50, while one remitting a third part of sins is 100. One of a year and fifteen days for saying the Ave Maria when the bell tolls is 12 grossi, and the same is charged for one for the repair of a bridge.[3]

---

[1] Joh. Voight, Stimmen aus Rom (v. Raumer's Historisches Taschenbuch, 1833, pp. 132, 140–3).

[2] Innoc. PP. VIII. Bull. *Non debet* (Bullar. I. 441).

[3] Libellus Taxarum super quibusdam in Cancellaria Apostolica impetrandis (sine nota, sed circa 1500) in White Historical Library, Cornell University, A. 6124.

The *grossus* at this time was reckoned in the chancery as one-eighth of a florin.

In the earliest tax-list, that of John XXII., in 1331, when the *grossus* was a tenth of a florin, the fee of the abbreviator for an indulgence to those visiting or helping a church was twelve *grossi*, and the same if simply for visiting or simply for aiding, while the scrivener's charge was sixteen for visiting or aiding and ten for simply aiding. In addition to these were the fees for bullation, registering etc.—Tangl, Die päpstlichen Kanzlei-Ordnungen, pp. 99, 105 (Innsbruck, 1894).

Partly this traffic is denied by modern apologists and partly it is defended, as by Gröne, who tells us that in an age of violence the Church could in no other way raise up defenders for itself. The common reproach that it gave its indulgences for money is a mistake, for it could not in any other manner more effectually emphasize the necessity of self-sacrifice on the sinner. So far from reproaching it with its free distribution of indulgences, we should rather admire the exhaustless strength given to it by God, through which it used the sins of the people and of the age to create a new source of salvation for them. Besides, in no other way could the community be aroused to build a church or undertake any affair of general utility; even the support of the churches and religious houses often depended on this, which explains why during the Middle Ages almost every church without exception had an indulgence.[1]

Yet, while thus the main object of indulgences was the raising of money or procuring some other temporal advantage, they were occasionally employed for more or less spiritual or charitable purposes. As regards spiritual works, it is observable that for the most part those rewarded in this manner were for some ulterior purpose and not for the spiritual benefit of the performer. The earliest on record would seem to be one instituted by Innocent III., in 1215, to avert an evil omen, in a manner worthy of an Etruscan haruspex. It is related that he carried the Veronica—the handkerchief impressed with the face of Christ—in procession as customary, and that, on being returned to its place of deposit, it turned itself upside down, which was regarded as a very threatening portent to him, whereupon, by the advice of his brethren, to reconcile himself to God, he composed a prayer in its honor, with a psalm attached, and gave ten days' indulgence for each repetition of this.[2] The next apparently is an indulgence of ten days accorded by Innocent IV., in 1250, for all who should pray for King Louis IX., at that time captive of the Saracens in Egypt[3]—a somewhat noteworthy concession, for it long remained for the theologians the staple authority for the assertion that indulgences could be granted for spiritual as well as for material objects. Yet it was soon followed by a similar grant at the prayer of Berengaria, daugh-

[1] Gröne, Der Ablass, pp. 72, 118–22. [2] Matt. Paris Hist. Angl. ann. 1216.
[3] Martene Thesaur. IV. 1702.

ter of St. Ferdinand of Castile, who had built a magnificent tomb for her grandmother Berengaria, and who obtained from Innocent, for ten years, forty days' remission for all visiting it to pray for her soul and ten days for repeating a Paternoster for her benefit.[1] There are other examples of the same kind, as one by Nicholas I., in 1289, of ten days for praying for Charles the Lame of Naples, then a prisoner in Aragon, and another by Clement V., in 1309, of twenty days for praying for his soul during five years.[2] Clement had already, in 1307, granted to Marguerite Countess of Evreux an indulgence of ten days for all praying for the soul of her father Philippe Count of Artois, or for herself, her husband and their children; also to Blanche, widow of Philippe, that a preacher preaching in her presence could grant ten days to those praying for her and for Philippe; also to Marguerite, that all listening to the word of God in her presence should gain forty days.[3] Similar are grants by John XXII., in 1317, to Isabella Duchess of Britanny of ten days for every day that any one may pray for her and of forty days for prayers for Philippe le Long, his wife and children, and for their souls after death; the same for Edward II. of England when he took the cross, and, in 1322, for Charles le Bel.[4] Of course in

[1] Raynald. ann. 1251, n. 27. [2] Ibid. ann. 1289, n 15; ann. 1309, n. 17.

[3] Regest. Clement. PP. V. ann. II. n. 1972, 1974, 1983, 2095. The privilege to magnates that all preaching in their presence should be empowered to grant indulgences was sufficiently common to have an established formula. In the formulary of the Avignonese Chancery this provides that if the preacher is a bishop he can grant a hundred days, if an abbot sixty, and if a priest forty.—Tangl, Die päpstlichen Kanzlei-Ordnungen, pp. 341, 356.

For the most part, apparently, the object was to secure a larger gathering, and consequently increased oblations, but this cannot always be assumed. In 1306 Clement V. grants to Margaret, Queen of Edward I., that her preacher can give an indulgence of forty days; in 1313 a similar grant is made to Richard, Abbot of St. Edmunds; in 1314 Walter, Archbishop-elect of Canterbury, is authorized to concede a hundred days to those present at his celebration of mass or hearing him preach; in 1318 John, Earl of Richmond, is honored by empowering his confessor to grant twenty days to those listening to a sermon in his chapel; in 1329 an indult to Queen Philippa concedes that her confessor may grant a hundred days to those present when a bishop preaches to her and sixty days when the preacher is of lower rank.—Bliss, Calendar of Papal Registers, II. 9, 115, 121, 170, 292.

[4] Rymer Fœdera, T. III. pp. 653-4.—Raynald. Annal. ann. 1317, n. 8, 49; 1322, n. 26.—Similarly, in 1308, Clement V. granted twenty days for prayers

this somewhat arbitrary dispensation of the treasure there must have been some personal or political motive, nor is the latter far to seek in he action of John XXII., when, involved in the quarrel with Louis of Bavaria, he ordered the introduction in the canon of the mass of two collects invoking the wrath of God on the enemies of the Church, and offered twenty days' remission to all priests thus celebrating and to all present devoutly praying—a decree which has been embodied in the collections of canon law.[1] It is rather to the pride of authorship that we may ascribe the "many indulgences" which he is said to have granted to those who would daily read a metrical account which he composed of the Passion, ending with a prayer.[2] A more noteworthy example of this species of indulgence is the one conceded by the council of Constance, in 1415, when the Emperor Sigismund departed on his mission to Aragon, and the council ordered weekly processions for his safety and success, to all participants in which a hundred days were offered and forty to all who would daily recite a Pater and Ave for the same object.[3]

The purely spiritual works, with no object save the benefit of the performer, for the stimulation of which in modern times indulgences are so profusely offered, were rarely thus encouraged during the middle ages. I am disposed to regard as wholly apocryphal one promising a year and forty days for kneeling at the name of Jesus, which Weigel declares that Pierre de la Palu says that Cardinal Henry of Susa asserts that he had seen.[4] I have been unable to verify it in these authors, and it is so grossly disproportioned to those customary in the middle of the thirteenth century that it would

for Queen Isabella of England, and, in 1327, John XXII. granted the same for the benefit of Edward III. (Bliss, Calendar of Papal Registers, II. 44, 261).

[1] Cap. 1 Extrav. Commun. Lib. III. Tit. xi.

[2] John of Winterthur enumerates this among the good works of John (Vitodurani Chron. ann. 1333).

Possibly it may be to some exaggeration of this that Wickliffe refers when he says "As men seien that a pope hath graunted two thousand yeer to ech man that is contrite and confessid of his synne that seith this orisoun 'Domine Jesu Christe' between the sacringe of the masse and the thridd Agnus Dei. And than it were ydil to traveile for ony pardoun sith a man mygte at home gete him fourty thousand yeer bi noone."—Arnold's Select English Works, Sermon XLVII. (I. 137). See also Serm. CII. (I. 354).

[3] C. Constantiens. Sess. XVII. (Harduin. VIII. 442).

[4] Weigel Claviculæ Indulgent. Cap. 28.

seem unworthy of credence. When, in 1262, Urban IV. instituted the feast of Corpus Christi he sought to insure its popular observance by offering a hundred days each for presence at matins, mass, and first and second vespers, and forty days for attendance at each of prime, tierce, sext, none, and complins, followed during the octave by a hundred days for presence at all the offices. This was an enormous bribe, but, as indulgences grew, something more was required, and, in 1429, Martin V. doubled these and added some more; apparently this proved insufficient, and, in 1433, Eugenius IV. doubled the offers of Martin.[1] Urban VI. imitated his predecessor Urban IV., when, in 1388, he was divinely inspired to institute the feast of the Visitation of Mary, but died before he could issue the bull, and Boniface IX. proclaimed it with the same indulgences. It, too, had a hard struggle for existence, as the Great Schism was raging and the lands of Avignonese obedience refused to recognize it, even after the Church had been united.[2] Besides these we sometimes meet with indulgences for pious observances. Plenaries were occasionally offered for peaceful visits to the Holy Land.[3] It argues a deplorable lack of zeal among the faithful when, in 1310, Henry, Bishop of Nantes, felt obliged to offer a remission of ten days to those who would remain in church until the end of the mass—a bribe which his successor Daniel limited to those truly repentant and confessed who would continue on their knees until the elevation of the cup.[4] In 1326 the council of Avignon granted from ten to thirty days for accompanying the sacrament to the sick and ten days for bending the head when the name of Jesus was uttered, offers which were repeated by the council of Beziers in 1351, while that

---

[1] Urbani PP. IV. Bull. *Transiturus*, 1262; Martini PP. V. Bull. *Ineffabile*, 1429; Eugen. PP. IV. Bull. *Excellentissimum*, 1433 (Bullar. I. 122, 308, 323).

In 1502 J. B. Surgant in a *Manuale Curatorum* gives an elaborate computation of the total obtainable, and makes it out 3800 days for the feast and 6000 for the octave.—Amort, I. 204.

The feast of Corpus Christi was long in winning its way with the public. Sixty years after its institution Trithemius says (Annal. Hirsaug. ann. 1325) that in spite of the indulgences it was generally neglected and held in contempt by most men.

[2] Bonifacii PP. X. Bull. *Superni*, 1390 (Bullar. I. 273).—Declaratio Joh. Hagen (Martene Ampl. Collect. I. 1579).

[3] Ripoll I. 294.—Campi, dell' Hist. Eccles. di Piacenza, II. 438.

[4] Mabillon Præf. in Sæc. V. Ord. S. Bened. n. 114.

of Narbonne, in 1374, increased by ten days the reward for accompanying the sacrament.[1] In 1368 the council of Lavaur ordered the church bells to be rung at sunrise, when all who would repeat five Paters and Aves with five genuflections were promised thirty days' remission.[2] A century later, in 1481, the council of Tournay repeats most of these, in some cases with slightly increased indulgences and adds a few more, such as thirty days for carrying the bodies of paupers to the grave and remaining during the obsequies, and twenty for rising when a priest passes, in honor of Christ and the Church.[3] These are trivial details, but they are worth recording if only for the contrast which they offer to modern lavishness in similar matters.

With regard to acts of individual charity and benevolence there is a notable absence of any endeavor to encourage them by the dispensation of the treasure. In fact, with the exception of the reward for burying the poor, just mentioned, that for feeding them by the Archbishop of Ravenna (p. 166), and perhaps one by Innocent III. for marrying prostitutes,[4] I have failed to find any among the innumerable indulgences of the mediæval period. The spirit of the age is condensed in Caietano's remark that it is no sin to refuse alms to a beggar and to spend the money on an indulgence, unless the beggar's necessity is extreme and there is no other help for him—and even then it is only a venial sin.[5] Beggars able to afford it, however, could procure letters authorizing them to grant indulgences to those who gave them alms, and such letters were used especially by pilgrims and captives ransomed from the infidel, who were thus enabled to repay the sums advanced for them or to indemnify those who had given security for the payment.[6] If, with this exception, the Church

[1] C. Avenionens. ann. 1326, cap. 2, 4; C. Bituricens. ann. 1351, cap. 1, 2; C. Narbonens. ann. 1374, cap. 19 (Harduin. VIII. 1494, 1495, 1690, 1691, 1884).

[2] C. Vaurens. ann. 1368, cap. 127 (Harduin. VIII. 1856).

[3] C. Tornacens. ann. 1481, cap. 4 (Gousset, Actes etc. II. 753–4).

[4] Innocent (Regest. I. 112) urges men to marry prostitutes out of Christian charity, and decrees that it shall avail them in remission of their sins. This is not a formal indulgence, but Raynaldus (ann. 1198, n. 38) speaks of it as such.

[5] Caietani Opusc. Tract. XVI. Q. 3.

[6] Hergenröther, Regest. Leonis PP. X. n. 3471, 4559, 5261, 5409, 5500, 6505,

thus withheld this potent means of stimulating the mutual kindliness and helpfulness which Christ so earnestly enjoined, it was, however, by no means lacking in effort to gather in money wherewith to build and maintain hospitals whereby it could teach the people to look to it alone as the benevolent and protecting mother. Of this the most noteworthy example was the great establishment known as the Santo Spirito in Saxia of Rome, to the support of which all Christendom was thus made to contribute. In 1204 Innocent III. founded it under the name of S. Maria in Saxia, in connection with the similar hospital, S. Spiritus in Montpellier, both being under the care of the Order of the Holy Spirit and devoted to the relief of the sick and poor and foundlings. No mention is made of indulgences, but both institutions were to be supported by the alms of the charitable and were licensed to beg throughout Europe, collectors being everywhere appointed—Italy, Sicily, England, and Hungary being allotted to the Roman establishment, and the rest of the Continent to the other.[1] Naturally, under the fostering care of succeeding popes, the Roman branch absorbed the gifts of the faithful, and when Nicholas IV., in 1291, took it under his protection he enumerated its numerous possessions throughout all the provinces of Italy and Sicily, Germany,

---

6936–7, 7535, 7847, 9132, 11193, 13933, 14015, 14802, 15575, 16512, 16520, 16619, 16724, 17520, etc.

In the *Formularium Instrumentorum ad usum Curie Romane*, fol. 64–5, there are two formulas for letters of this kind for beggars, one for a ransomed captive, good for two years, authorizing him to give a hundred days' indulgence, and one for pilgrims. As late as 1596 Padre Jerónimo Gracian, the spiritual director of Santa Teresa, after three years' captivity in Tunis, was ransomed by a Jew named Samuel Escanasi. The cost of his liberation was 2000 ducats, to repay which he obtained from Clement VIII. one of these letters.—Marmól, Trabajos y vida del padre Maestro Gracian, Cap. 13. 14.

[1] Innocent PP. III. Bull. *Inter opera* (Bullar. I. 58).

In 1208 Innocent instituted a solemnity on the Sunday following the octave of Epiphany, when the canons of St. Peter's carried the Veronica to the hospital, and the pope and cardinals celebrated mass and preached. An indulgence of a year was granted to all present, but this was not conditioned on contributions, for, on the contrary, the spectators were fed and a small sum of money given to each. This was confirmed by Honorius III. in 1223, who specified the donation as three deniers for 1000 strangers and 300 citizens. Alexander IV. confirmed it in 1255.—Innoc. PP. III. Regest. X. 179.—Innoc. PP. III. Gesta, n. 144.—Raynald. ann. 1223, n. 21.—Bullar. Vatican. I. 90, 110, 133.

France, England, and Spain.[1] Amid the cloud of fabrications through which it sought to win the alms of the faithful it is not easy to determine when it was first enriched with an indulgence. Possibly there may be some foundation for one claimed to have been issued by Boniface VIII. granting to all contributors a remission of one-seventh of enjoined penance and a plenary at death.[2] Subsequent pontiffs enlarged this concession, and, in 1478, Sixtus IV. recites that through wars and troubles its revenues had declined, its buildings had become ruinous and he had torn them down and reconstructed them. To defray the expenses he formed a Confraternity of the Holy Ghost, membership in which was obtained by a voluntary contribution and secured plenary remission, with the customary privilege of choosing a confessor and also of participation in masses for the souls of dead members. This was confirmed by Leo X., and, in 1516, we happen to have the formula of the indulgence and absolution sold in Germany by the *quæstuarii* of the hospital. The purchaser had his name inscribed in the book of the confraternity and received a certificate entitling him to plenary remission once in life and at death, and to the benefit of his share in 32,000 masses and as many psalters annually. The absolution granted under this was of the widest and most comprehensive kind, relieving him from hell and purgatory, and opening to him the gates of heaven.

---

[1] Nich. PP. IV. Bull. *Inter opera* (Bullar. I. p. 165).

[2] This is doubtless much exaggerated, for there is an indulgence of only forty days, granted for three years by Boniface VIII., in 1295, to the hospital of Santa Croce at Nursia, which had represented to him that it had not means to care for the numerous sick flocking to it. It was a dependency of the church of St. Peter at Rome.—Bullar. Vatican. I. 224.

[3] Sixti PP. IV. Bull. *Illius qui* (Bullar. I. 408).—Widemanni Chron. Curiæ ann. 1516 (Menkenii Rer. Germ. Scriptt. III. 735-7). In reality it was Christiern I. of Denmark, who, when in Rome in 1474, rebuilt the hospital.—Boissen Chron. Slesvicens. (Menken. III. 622).

After St. Pius V. prohibited elcemosynary indulgences, the hospital supported itself by opening a bank of deposit (Bruzen la Martinière, Le Grand Dictionnaire géographique, R. p. 153). As it could only do this by lending the moneys at interest it was profiting by a sin for which it had formerly sold indulgences.

Amort (I. 202) prints one of the letters of the *quæstuarii*, issued in 1470, before the bull of Sixtus IV. It recites that Innocent III., Honorius III., Gregory IX., Alexander IV., Clement IV., Nicholas IV., Boniface VIII., and Martin V. had each remitted for it one-seventh of sins—making eight sevenths

Another form of indulgence is the personal one, issued to an individual for his sole behoof. If, as we have seen (p. 11), the confessor could grant any remission he pleased to his penitent, there would seem to be no reason why the pope, with his supreme authority, should be confined to general formulas and should not be able to concede the benefit to any one whom he might wish to favor. Yet apparently the custom was long in establishing itself, for the earliest case I have met is the very liberal one of a hundred years, bestowed, in 1307, by Clement V., on Blanche, daughter of St. Louis and widow of the Infante Ferdinand de la Cerda of Castile, which is in marked contrast to one of only a hundred days by the same pope, in 1309, to Queen Isabella of England.[1] They speedily became one of the recognized articles of traffic by the curia with a fixed tariff of fees. They were in fact only the old confessional letters authorizing the choice of a confessor (Vol. I. p. 325) with the addition of powers for him to confer a plenary indulgence, either in life or on the death-bed, and their issue by the papal chancery was merely selling by retail what was done by wholesale through commissioners and *quæstuarii*. Under Eugenius IV. a large business was transacted in them, and, about 1465, Paul II. regulated the traffic, as he says, in order that through them men may not be rendered more prone to sin, nor the letters themselves fall into contempt through their multiplication. Accordingly he fixed the fees for the scrivener, the secretary, the registry, the bullation and the collation, amounting in all to two florins; if reserved cases were included there was a charge of two *grossi* more.[2] Varieties of these are enumerated in a tax-list of the

---

in all, which is a palpable falsehood, at least as regards all but the latter pontiff. Besides this, patriarchs and cardinals, archbishops and bishops, had cumulated upon it indulgences amounting to eighty *carinæ*, 1400 days of mortals and thirty-two years of venials. The most significant passage is one promising to all priests who labor for it one-third of the sums which they may collect.

[1] Clement. PP. V. Regest. ann. II. n. 1951.—Bliss, Calendar of Papal Registers, II. 55.

[2] S. Antonini Summæ P. I. Tit. x. Cap. 3, §§ 4, 5.—Tangl, Das Taxwesen u. s. w. (Mitthleilungen des Instituts für österreichische Geschichtsforschung, XII. 69-70). In the 1331 tax-list of John XXII. the abbreviator's fee for a confessional letter is six *grossi* and the same for a plenary indulgence, while that of the scrivener is ten *grossi* for the former and fourteen for the latter, while husband and wife could get one together for sixteen.—Tangl, Die Päpst-

chancery about 1500, and twenty-five florins are asked for one granting to a king and queen the same indulgence as though they went to Rome, while the same for a simple knight is rated at a fourth of that amount.[1] In the St. Peter's bull *Liquet omnibus*, issued in 1510, these individual letters are included in the suspension of all indulgences, in order to afford as wide a market as possible for the general indulgence.[2] When, after the reforms of St. Pius V., these letters were no longer an object of merchandise, they were distributed, as we shall see hereafter, with the most reckless prodigality. Viva tells us that they require no works to be performed; they are applicable to the dead, but a decision of the Congregation of Indulgences, in 1839, defines that while the recipient can either use the indulgence himself or apply it to a soul in purgatory, he must make the election and cannot employ it for both.[3]

Closely connected with indulgences, yet not precisely identical with them, is the license to mitigate the severity of fasts by the use of eggs and milk-food, which forms a prominent feature of the cruzada. The origin of this is probably attributable to the early part of the fourteenth century. There is no formula for it in the thirteenth century Formulary of the Papal Penitentiary, but in the tax-list of Benedict XII., in 1338, we find letters "de esu carnium et lacticiniorum," issued by the Penitentiary, for which the scrivener's fee is fixed at the handsome sum of three livres tournois.[4] They

---

lichen Kanzlei-Ordnungen, pp. 98–99, 104 (Innsbruck, 1894). In 1477 the church of Xaintes, in defending itself from the charge of fixing too high a price on the confessional letters which it was empowered to issue under an indulgence, asserts that in Rome such letters, with less privileges, cost three florins (from a copy in my possession).

In 1419 the Grand Master of the Teutonic Order writes to his agent in Rome to procure for him a confessional letter, good during life; his chaplain, Sylvester, also wants one, and when the price is ascertained it will be remitted.—Joh. Voight, Stimmen aus Rom (v. Raumer's Historiches Taschenbuch, 1833, p. 135). This shows that the fees in the tax-lists were only for the expenses, and that there was an indeterminate charge by the curia, dependent on the station or wealth of the applicant.

[1] Libellus Taxarum (White Hist. Library, Cornell Univ. A. 6124).

[2] Bull. *Liquet omnibus* § 20 (Bullar. I. 505).

[3] Viva de Jubilæo p. 81.—Decreta Authentica n. 504.

[4] P. Denifle, Die älteste Taxrolle der apost. Pönitentiarie (Archiv f. Litt. und Kirchengeschichte, IV. 229).

were still a novelty, for it is spoken of as an innovation when, in the crusading indulgence preached in 1344, by order of Clement VI., all who put money into the chests provided in the churches, were promised, in addition to the plenary, the perpetual privilege of eating eggs and milk-food in all fasts except the Fridays of Lent, and ten years later indulgences granting this privilege were for the first time sold in Augsburg, where they proved very popular and produced much money.[1] Yet they seem to have fallen into disuse, for when, in 1490, *Butterbriefe*, as they were called, were procured and sold in aid of a bridge over the Saale and to restore the church of Freiburg, which had been destroyed by the Hussites, they aroused a lively controversy. The Dominicans and Franciscans accused the canons of obtaining them surreptitiously, so that they were obliged to procure another papal brief, dated July 14, 1492. Johann von Saalhausen, Bishop of Meissen, supported the mendicants, and the chief combatant was the Dominican preacher Georg Orter, who had lived long in Rome and was indignant at seeing the Germans obliged to pay for a privilege which was freely enjoyed there. Georg, Duke of Saxony, interposed and ordered both sides to set forth their arguments in writing, but before this was done Alexander VI. silenced the opposition by a bull of August 25, 1496. When the twenty years for which the privilege was granted expired, Frederic the Wise procured its renewal and ordered it published, instructing all priests to announce that absolution would be refused to those who ate the forbidden articles without a *Butterbrief*, while the Bishops of Meissen and Merseburg threatened their subjects with temporal and eternal punishment if they withheld their contributions.[2] It was in vain that Bartolommeo Fumo complained that the release from the obligation of fasting, which by that time had become the usual adjunct of indulgences and was purchasable for a carlino, was one of the abuses that was working the ruin of the Church.[3] The feature was found too profitable to be abandoned, as it formed one of the chief attractions of the indulgences to which it was attached, for the penitent could gratify his appetite and at the same time acquire all

[1] Trithem. Chron. Hirsaug. ann. 1344.—Gassari Annales Augstburgenses ann. 1354 (Menken. R. Germ. Scriptt. I. 1481).

[2] Gröne, Der Ablass, pp. 111–12.

[3] Aurea Armilla s. v. *Indulgentia* n. 12.

the merits of fasting. In 1573 the Venetian envoy at Madrid tells us that it was the principal inducement for the purchase of the bull of the cruzada, especially in places remote from the coast where fish was procured with difficulty, and about 1600 Rodriguez confirms this statement.[1] Onofri defends this feature of the crociata granted to Naples, in 1778, by arguing that the rich can always escape fasting by getting certificates from their physicians on which their confessors grant them dispensations, and that the *bolla* thus merely restores the equality of the poor.[2] At the present day in Spain the *Bula de Lacticinios* or *Indulto Cuadragesimal*, which permits the use of eggs and milk-food, except during Holy Week, is paid for separately from the bull of indulgence, though the purchase of the latter is a condition precedent. Its cost is rated according to classes and wealth, and ranges from ten cents to about $1.80, and it is good for a year. It is purely territorial; strangers in Spain can enjoy it, but Spaniards leaving their country cannot avail themselves of it, even though they may have bought it.[3]

---

[1] Perez de Lara, Compendio de las tres Gracias, pp. 12, 78.—Relazioni Venete, Serie I. Tom. VI. p. 379.—Rodriguez, Bolla della S. Crociata, p. 23. See also Comtesse D'Aulnoy, *La Cour et la Ville de Madrid*, Lettre IX.

[2] Onofri, Spiegazione della Bolla della S. Crociata. Sermoni, pp. 47–9. Onofri prints some songs written to popularize the crociata. In one of these there is a stanza on this feature of the indulgence—

Que' libi, che a ciascuno,
Proscritti ha nel digiuno
L'esimia Autorità,
Cangiarli anche potete
S'oggi pietà avrete
Di chi fra ceppi stà.
A questo santo Zelo
V'invita il Rè del cielo
Con liberal pietà.—Ib. p. 131.

[3] Salces, Explicacion de la Bula de la Santa Cruzada, pp. 40, 117.

CHAPTER IV.

THE JUBILEE.

We have seen how slow was the growth of indulgences, except for crusades, throughout the thirteenth century. With the fourteenth their development becomes accelerated gradually, and with the fifteenth their expansion continues rapidly. A leading factor in this was the invention of the jubilee, a remarkable outgrowth of the system, which merits special attention.

As a matter of course the indiscreet zeal of post-Tridentine theologians claims for the jubilee, as for all other indulgences, an origin in Apostolic times. Even the secular games celebrated by the Emperor Philip, 1000 A. U. C. (246 A. D.), have been pressed into service, on the presumption that Philip was a Christian and held them in honor of Christ and the Church.[1] That Rome, however, should be the most popular resort of pilgrims, when pilgrimage came in fashion, was perfectly natural. Though it had not Calvary and the Holy Sepulchre to offer for the veneration of the faithful, it was far more accessible than Jerusalem, and it had the relics of St. Peter

---

[1] Azpilcuetæ Comment. de Jobilæo, Notab. I. n. 11; Notab. VII.—Zerola Sancti Jubilæi ac Indulgent. Tract. Lib. II. Cap. 9.—Viva de Jubilæo et Indulg. p. 4.—Bianchi, Foriero dell' Anno Santo, p. 323.—Ricci de' Giubilei Universali, p. 23.—Pauli Orosii Historiarum Lib. VII. Cap. 20.

Even so learned a writer as Zaccaria (Dell' Anno Santo, I. 5) falls foul of Van Espen (Jur. Eccles. P. II. Tit. vii. n. 1) for saying that there is no monument respecting the jubilee earlier than the bull *Antiquorum* of Boniface VIII. in 1300, and he seeks to prove that it was not invented by Boniface. He even quotes a Dominican story that a relative of St. Dominic, at the age of fifteen, went to Rome, in 1200, for a jubilee and survived to attend that of 1300.

Theodorus a Spiritu Sancto (Tract. de Jubilæo Cap. II. § 1, n. 9) endeavors to reconcile fact and fiction by arguing that previous to Boniface IX. there were partial indulgences in Rome every hundredth year, but that he was the first to offer plenaries. More zealous was Cosimo Montigiani, who, in 1575, published in Florence his *Trattato del' Anno del SS. Jubileo*, in which (p. 9) he proves the jubilee to be of divine law, of natural law, and of written law, and besides has its prototype in the *ludi sæculares* of the Romans.

and St. Paul, and of a countless number of confessors and martyrs whose intercession was most potent, and whose shrines attracted an endless stream of devotees from western and central Europe. As early as the end of the fourth century Chrysostom alludes with pride to the emperors, consuls, and leaders of armies who gathered at the tombs of the humble fisherman and tent-maker. The Barbarian invasions imposed only a temporary check on this manifestation of piety. Saxon England had scarce been fairly Christianized when we find Wilfred of York in his youth seeking the shrine of St. Peter to pray to him for the pardon of his sins, and after his elevation to the see of York he twice again went thither to appeal from the persecution of his enemies.[2] So rapidly did the custom grow that by the middle of the eighth century St. Boniface calls for some restrictions to be laid on the pilgrimage to Rome of women and nuns, for he says that scarce a city in France, the Rhinelands and Lombardy, but had Saxon prostitutes supplied from female pilgrims who had been led astray.[3] The tombs of Saxon kings in the Roman churches—of Kenred, Buhred, Ceadwalla and his successor Ina with his queen—show the fatality as well as the attraction of the eternal city,[4] while, more illustrious than the rest, Cnut went thither, in 1027, to pray for the intercession of the apostles and saints, and utilized the occasion to obtain from Conrad the Salic and Rodolph, King of Burgundy, assurances that English pilgrims should no longer be maltreated on the road.[5] In France a formula of Marculfus shows how customary were these pious acts in the seventh century.[6] Charlemagne's four visits to Rome are stated by Einhardt to have been for the purpose of prayer and in discharge of vows, though we may readily believe that political objects were not lacking.[7] Claudius of Turin expressed his doubts as to the spiritual benefit

[1] S. Jo. Chrysost. Quod Christus sit Deus n. 9.

[2] Eadmeri Vit. S. Wilfridi n. 9.—Causa Wilfridiana (Migne, LXXXIX. 42).

[3] S. Bonifacii Epist. 105.

[4] Anglo-Saxon Chronicle ann. 709, 874.—Bede (Hist. Eccles. Lib. v. Cap. vii.), after chronicling the pilgrimage of Ceadwalla and Ina, adds, "Quod his temporibus plures de gente Anglorum, nobiles, ignobiles, laici, clerici, viri ac feminæ certatim facere consuerunt."

[5] Guill. Malmesburiens. de Gestis Regum ann. 1030.

[6] Marculfi Formular. Lib. II. Cap. 49.

[7] Eginhardi Vit. Caroli Magni Cap. 27.—Annal. Laurissens. ann. 800.

derived from the pilgrimage, for which Jonas of Orleans took him to task,[1] and Bishop Ahyto of Bâle endeavored to check it by forbidding clerics to go to Rome for prayer, or laymen until after they should have confessed their sins at home,[2] but this was of little use. In 850 the Emperor Louis II. complains that pilgrims on their way to Rome and merchants are robbed, and he orders this to be vigorously repressed by his officials.[3] The insecurity of the roads in the anarchy attending the dissolution of the Carlovingian empire and the toils and hardships of the journey show how imperious was the desire which impelled the faithful to Rome, and enabled, in 865, Nicholas I., in his quarrel with the Emperor Michael over Photius, to boast, with pardonable exaggeration, of the thousands who daily came from all quarters to seek the protection and intercession of the Prince of the Apostles.[4] An incident related by Odo of Cluny, about the middle of the tenth century, illustrates the motive which drew these crowds to Rome. A concubinary priest of Avranches, unable to abandon his evil courses, yet fearful of the punishment in store for him, made no less than nine pilgrimages to St. Peter in hopes of winning from him pardon by this show of devotion, but the fruitlessness of the device when unaccompanied by amendment was seen when, on his return from the ninth journey, he expired in the arms of the partner of his sin.[5]

No indulgences thus far were necessary to stimulate this influx of devotees, and we have seen that during the eleventh century the popes did not deem it requisite to increase in this manner the attractions of the Roman churches. The absence of indulgences is indicated by the fact that when, in 1116, Paschal II. held a general council in the Lateran, at its conclusion he bestowed a remission of forty days on all who had come to Rome to attend the council and for the benefit of their souls.[6] With the development of the system in the twelfth century Rome naturally was forced to offer advantages like those of rival shrines, but although the popes took care to maintain the superiority of the apostolic city, the pardons offered were

[1] Jonæ Aurelianens. de Cultu Imaginum Lib. III.
[2] Ahythonis Capitulare, n. xviii. (D'Achery, I. 585).
[3] Capit. Ludov. II. Tit. 1, Cap. 1 (Baluze, II. 233).
[4] Nicolai PP. I. Epist. LXXXVI.
[5] Odon. Cluniacens. Collationum Lib. II. Cap. 27.
[6] Conrad. Urspergens. Chron. ann. 1116.

very moderate in comparison with modern profusion. Towards the close of the century Peter Cantor enumerates them and informs us that on Holy Thursday pilgrims from beyond seas obtained three years, while those from nearer points gained two. On the feast-days of the martyrs, moreover, there were remissions of one-third or one-fourth of penance, but nothing for anniversaries of dedications.[1] During the thirteenth century there was, of course, some increase, but it was very gradual. In 1222 Honorius III. conferred on S. Maria Maggiore one year and forty days for its consecration feast, and when, in 1238, Gregory IX. dedicated the high altar of St. Sabina he granted only the same for visits on the anniversary and during the octaves.[2] The highest standard of pontifical liberality, however, is to be looked for in St. Peter's, and there we find the first recorded indulgence, in 1240, granted to it by Gregory IX. The preamble sets forth that it is the mother of all churches, deserving the most ardent veneration of all Christians, wherefore, to attract to it the faithful by indulgences, he grants to those who visit it with congruous devotion from Pentecost to the octave of Peter and Paul (July 6) a remission of three years and three quarantines of enjoined penance—to which, in 1263, Urban IV. added an extension of time up to the feast St. Peter *ad vincula* (Aug. 1). In 1260 Alexander IV. granted two years and two quarantines for visiting it on the feast of St. Mark (April 25). When, in 1279, Nicholas III. built and consecrated in it an altar to St. Nicholas, he conceded a year and a quarantine for the anniversary of the consecration and the feast of the saint. In addition to these, as we have seen, Aquinas alludes incidentally to a perennial indulgence of forty days enjoyed by the church, the source of which is unknown.[3] The moderation of these renders it probable that when, in 1289, Nicholas IV. framed an inventory of its indulgences, based on examination of the muniments and of the memories of the canons, the latter took advantage of the opportunity to interpolate a few, for the enumeration sets forth remissions of seven years and seven quarantines obtainable on fifty-three days of the year, others of three years

[1] P. Cantoris MS. Summa de Sacramentis (Morin. de Pœnit. Lib. x. Cap. 20).

[2] Raynald. Annal. ann. 1222, n. 38.—Morin. de Pœnit. Lib. x. Cap. 23.

[3] Bullar. Vatican, I. 123, 141, 143, 203.—S. Th. Aquin. Summæ Suppl. Q. xxv. Art. ii. ad 4.

and three quarantines on about the same number of days, others of one year and forty days on eighty-eight days, and forty days on every day. All these he confirmed and added to them an indulgence of a year and forty days for every day in the year, one of three years and three quarantines obtainable on seventy-eight days, and another of two years and two quarantines to be gained on thirty-three feasts and on every day when there is a station arranged in the church.[1] Small as these favors may seem to us now, they were excessively liberal for the period, for when, in 1297, Boniface VIII. desired to render the Stations of Rome (of which more hereafter) more attractive, he only gave an annual indulgence of a year and forty days for visiting the churches at any time from Ash Wednesday to Resurrection, and an additional hundred days for the papal benediction.[2]

It can therefore readily be imagined what a sensation was produced throughout Europe when, February 22, 1300, Boniface VIII. suddenly proclaimed that during the year, from the previous Christmas to the next, and in every following hundredth year, he conceded, from the plenitude of apostolic power, to those visiting the basilicas of St. Peter and St. Paul, whether penitent and confessed or about to be penitent and to confess, not only full and larger, but the fullest pardon of their sins; those desiring to obtain these indulgences, if Romans, must visit these basilicas for thirty days, if foreigners for fifteen, but any one could gain more merit and more efficaciously win the indulgence insomuch as he made the visits more frequently and devoutly. There is a preamble to the bull reciting that it is stated of old that great remissions have been conceded to those visiting St. Peter's, all of which are confirmed, but there is no assumption that this has anything to do with the present grant, nor is any reference made to the Jewish jubilee.[3]

There evidently was no premeditation in this movement, or it would have been announced in advance and not have been delayed until near the end of February, when a large portion of the year must be passed before the glad tidings could reach the distant faith-

---

[1] Bullar. Vatican, I. 213, 214.

[2] Bullar. Vatican, T. III. Append. p. 6.—Raynald. ann. 1297, n. 70.

[3] Bonifacii PP. VIII. Bull. *Antiquorum*, 22 Feb. 1300 (Bullar. I. 179.—Cap. 1 Extrav. Commun. Lib. v. Tit. ix.).

ful. It was probably a chance suggestion, eagerly caught and hastily put into execution. It doubtless excited criticism, for the nephew of Boniface, Cardinal Jacopo Caietano, was put forward to prepare an official account and justification of the matter, in which he argues that Boniface acted not impulsively but maturely and with the advice of the Sacred College, and he deprecates the suggestion that so many thousand souls could have been led into error by the chair of Peter. His explanation is that a man claiming to be 107 years of age appeared before the pope and cardinals, declaring that his father, in 1200, had come to Rome for an indulgence and had ordered him to do the same if he should live until 1300. Such a belief was said to exist in France, and Boniface, after prolonged consultation with the cardinals, framed the bull, which, after many emendations, was published on an appropriate feast-day.[1]

Boniface, it will be observed, made no pretence that there was any precedent for his action, and for a long while his successors referred to him as the first who had proclaimed a jubilee.[2] The post-Tridentine theologians however, as we have seen, claimed for the custom an antiquity coeval with the primitive Church, and, in 1599, Clement VIII. saw fit, in announcing the jubilee of 1600, to assert that it was a most ancient institute of the Church to grant the most ample indulgences every hundredth year to pilgrims coming to Rome.[3] Exhaustive efforts have consequently been made to find some evidence in support of the assumption, but without success.[4]

---

[1] Jacobi Cardinalis de Jubilæo Cap. 2, 3, 15 (Max. Bibl. Pat. XIII. 481.)—Vit. Pontif. Roman (Muratori S. R. I. III. 617).

[2] Clement. PP. VI. Bull. *Unigenitus* (Extrav. Commun. Lib. v. Tit. ix. Cap. 2).—Urbani PP. VI. Bull. *Salvator noster*, 1389 (Amort, I. 85).—Pauli PP. II. Bull. *Ineffabilis*, 1470 (Bullar. I. 385).—Sixti PP. IV. Bull. *Pastoris æterni*, 1475 (Zaccaria, Dell' Anno Santo, I. 195).—Cf. S. Antonini Summæ P. I. Tit. x. Cap. 3 § 6.—Alex. PP. VI. Bull. *Inter curas*, 1499 (Steph. ex Nottis, fol. 160).—Felicis Hemmerlin Dyalogus de anno jubileo; Recapitulatio de anno jubileo (Basil. 1497).

[3] Clement. PP. VIII. Const. *Annus Domini* (Bullar. IV. 83).

[4] The only scrap of proof that can be cited is a cursory remark in Alberic of Troisfontaines—"dicitur quod annus iste *quinquagesimus* seu Jubilæus et remissionis in curia Romana sit celebratus" (Alb. Triumfont. Chron. ann. 1208). The insertion of this under the year 1208 and its allusion to the fiftieth year evidently deprives it of all significance as respects the celebration ordered by Boniface in 1300, and every hundredth year thereafter. Moreover, had there been either in 1200 or 1208 anything like the observance of 1300 it would have

The device was too strictly in line with the feelings and aspirations of the age to be a failure. No sooner was it announced that plenary remission could be had by the simple duty of visiting two churches for thirty days, than the whole population of Rome, we are told, poured into them. As the news was bruited abroad pilgrims from beyond the Alps came like the march of armies. Some even had time to reach Rome from Spain; there were few from England, on account of the wars, but multitudes from France. Aged men were brought on litters, and from Savoy there came one more than a hundred years old, carried by his son. In Rome the crowds were so great that many were crushed, and a famine was feared, but fortunately there were abundant harvests and God provided for all.[1] This semi-official statement is fully borne out by eye-witnesses. Guillelmo Ventura says that during his stay of fifteen days he many times saw men and women trampled under foot, and more than once he narrowly escaped the same fate; on Christmas eve the crowd was estimated by the Romans at two millions.[2] Giovanni Villani declares that a great part of Christendom was there, and that during the whole year there were 200,000 pilgrims in the city, besides those on the road.[3] Dante can find no better comparison for the multitude of the damned in Malebolge than the crowds in Rome during the jubilee.[4] That there should be legends of miraculous cures and

---

been minutely described by all the annalists of the period, as was the latter, and the theologians of the thirteenth century, who discussed so fully all the phases of indulgences, could not have avoided some allusion to it.

[1] Card. Jac. Caietano de Jubilæo Cap. 4–7.

[2] Chron. Astens. Cap. 26 (Muratori, S. R. I. XI. 191).

[3] Villani Cronica Lib. VIII. Cap. 36. All the chronicles of the period give more or less full accounts of the jubilee, showing the universal attention which it attracted. See Annal. Domin. Colmariens. ann. 1300 (Urstisii S. Rer. Germ. II. 33).—Guillel. Nangiac. Chron. ann. 1300.—Grandes Chroniques, Phelippe le Bel, XXXIII.—Bern. Guidon. Vit. Bonif. VIII. (Muratori, S. R. I. I. 671).—Amalr. Augerii Vit. Bonif. VIII. (Ibid. III. II. 437).—Ptol. Lucens. Hist. Eccles. Lib. XXIV. Cap. 36 (Ibid. XI. 1203).—Annales Cæsenatens. ann. 1300 (Ibid. XIV. 1119).—Trithem. Chron. Hirsaug. ann. 1300.

[4] Come i Roman per l'esercito molto,
L'anno del giubbileo, su per lo ponte
Hanno a passar la gente molto tolto,
Che da un lato tutti hanno la fronte
Verso l' castello e vanno a Santo Pietro
Del altro sponde vanno verso 'l monte.—Inferno, XVIII.

In this he alludes to a regulation made by Boniface, that in crossing the

releases from diabolic possession is a matter of course, and the demons ejected declared with howls that multitudes of souls were saved and that Peter and Paul had emptied purgatory.[1]

The expectations of profit from the oblations of the faithful were fully realized, although the indulgence was not conditioned on payment. Ventura states that the amount received by Boniface was incomputable, and that at the altar of St. Paul there stood, day and night, two clerks raking in infinite money. Villani adds that besides the gains accruing to the Church the Romans were all enriched. Cardinal Caietano admits that the altar of St. Peter took in about 30,000 gold florins and that of St. Paul about 20,000, which, he says, Boniface laid out in the purchase of lands for the basilicas.[2] That the object was regarded at the time as purely financial is inferable from Astesanus, who, in 1317, in arguing that indulgences may be, and sometimes are, granted for spiritual objects, only adduces in support the ten days for praying for Louis IX. and the remissions offered to those who preach the cross.[3] If so impressive an event as the jubilee had been considered as springing from spiritual motives he could scarce have omitted to adduce an example so notable.

Appetite grows by what it feeds on. The hundred years which Boniface had prescribed as an interval was a long while to wait for a repetition of a celebration so profitable, and when Clement VI. ascended the papal throne at Avignon, in 1342, a deputation of Roman nobles and citizens (among whom, it is said, were Rienzo and Petrarch), sent to him to tender the allegiance of the city, besought him to reduce the term to fifty years. St. Birgitta of Sweden also sent him a revelation ordering him to make peace between England and France, and come to Rome and proclaim the year of salvation and divine love. He readily agreed to the latter, and on January 27, 1343, issued his bull proclaiming that, in view of the Hebrew jubilee and of the shortness of human life, he diminished the interval prescribed by his predecessor to fifty years, so that all those performing the pious exercises as laid down by Boniface should

---

bridge of the castle of S. Angelo all going in one direction should keep on one side.

[1] Raynald. ann. 1300 n. 7.—Ricci, dei Giubilei universali, p. 29.

[2] Chron. Astens. *loc. cit.*—Villani Chron. *loc. cit.*—Caietani de Jubilæo Cap. 9.—Raynald. ann. 1300.

[3] Astesani Summæ Lib. v. Tit. xl. Art. 4 § 2.

gain the same indulgences. To the churches of St. Peter and St. Paul, however, he added the Lateran, and he further provided that those who should be legitimately impeded on the road or before they fulfilled the allotted rounds should enjoy the same reward.[1]

Although the Black Death had seriously diminished the population of Europe and still lingered in some places; although Philippe de Valois, involved in disastrous war with England, forbade all pilgrimages, whether to Rome or Compostella, and no one could leave France without a royal letter, and though the season was cold and wet and the roads encumbered with robbers, the crowds pressing into Rome were unprecedented. Matteo Villani relates that the wayside houses were unable to accommodate the pilgrims, who lay in the open fields, building fires to keep themselves from freezing, yet were they all peaceful and helpful, enduring their hardships and assisting their weaker comrades. It was impossible to enumerate the multitudes, but it was estimated in Rome that from Christmas

[1] Clement PP. VI. Bull. *Unigenitus* (Cap. 2 Extrav. Commun. Lib. v. Tit. x.).—S. Birgittæ Revelat. Lib. vi. Cap. lxiii.—Raynald. ann. 1342, n. 20; ann. 1379, n. 8.—Clement PP. VI. Vita Tertia (Muratori S. R. I. III. ii. 573).

Another bull, dated June 27, 1346, was circulated, clearly supposititious, in which he is made to assume complete control over the future life and order the angels to liberate from purgatory the souls of those who might die on the road (P. de Herenthals Vit. Clement. VI. *ap.* Muratori S. R. I. III. ii. 584–7). This obtained wide currency, but St. Antonino expresses doubts of its genuineness on account of its not being in the style of the curia, and says that Nicholas V. did not approve its extravagance (Summæ P. i. Tit. x. Cap. 3, § 6). Still, as we shall see, it was subsequently relied upon to prove the papal power to issue indulgences for souls in purgatory. At the time, however, the motive of the forgery is probably to be found in a clause providing that if any Benedictine shall desire to make the pilgrimage and his abbot refuses permission, he shall take three witnesses and demand it, together with the cost of food and clothing for a year, when the abbot shall grant it under pain of the curse of Peter and Paul and perpetual deprivation of office. This doubtless produced abundant trouble among the monasteries.

When the jubilee became an established custom, however, all ordinary restrictions were suspended in its favor. The bishop could attend it without licence from the pope, the cleric without that of his bishop, the monk without that of his abbot. The wife could go against her husband's will, and though she sinned in so doing she nevertheless gained the indulgence. Persons of quality could travel on horseback, and not like common folk on foot. He who was lawfully impeded could send some one to represent him, and thus obtain the pardon vicariously.—Steph. ex Nottis Opus Remissionis, fol. 11.

to Easter there were always from 1,000,000 to 1,200,000 strangers in the city, at Ascension and Pentecost 800,000. During the summer heats the average fell off to 200,000, and as the year drew to a close the multitude increased nearly to what it had been at the beginning. The streets were so filled that it was impossible to move except with the crowd. The visit to the three churches and the return to a lodging-house made a round of about eleven miles to be traversed each day. On every Sunday and principal feast-day the Veronica was exhibited at St. Peter's, and the press there was so great that sometimes two, four or six, or even as many as a dozen persons were trampled to death. At each church the pilgrims offered what they pleased, and in addition to this the Romans universally turned innkeepers, created an artificial scarcity and extorted all they could from their guests.[1]

The pope had placed Rome under the government of his legate, Cardinal Annibaldo, who, in view of the unmanageable crowds and the difficulty of feeding them, obtained authority to diminish the fifteen days of visiting, and in the exercise of his discretion reduced it at times to eight days and even to a single day. This angered the Romans, who saw in it only an effort to cut down their gains, and there was much trouble. An altercation between one of his servants and the mob caused his palace to be besieged, and it was with difficulty that it was saved from pillage or worse. When he endeavored to perform the rounds of the churches for the benefit of his own soul, while on the way from St. Peter's to St. Paul's, two cross-bow shafts were discharged at him, one of which pierced his cap, so that thereafter he always wore a morion under his cap and a cuirass under his robe. The arrows had come from an unoccupied house, which was broken open on the spot, but no one was found in it, though two tell-tale cross-bows were discovered. The assassins were never traced, though a priest was tortured in the hope of unravelling the plot, and the cardinal's suspicions finally centred on Cola di Rienzo, whom he removed from the tribuneship, annulled all his acts, and

[1] Clementis PP. VI. Vita prima (Muratori S. R. I. III. II. 552).—Guill. de Nangiac. Contin. ann. 1350.—Chron. Ægidii de Muisis (De Smet, Corp. Chron. Flandriæ, II. 385) —Matt. Villani Istorie Lib. I. Cap. 56 (Muratori, S. R. I. XVI. 56).—Matt. Neoburg. (Alb. Argentinensis) ann. 1350 (Urstisii S. Germ. Hist. II. 155).—Mag. Chron. Belgic. ann. 1350 (Pistorii Rer. Germ. Script. III. 328).

excommunicated him with awful curses. The French Cardinal of San Grisogono, who chanced to be in Rome, consoled him by saying, "If you want to reform Rome, you must level it with the ground and build it anew." His troubles came to an end, however, not without suspicions of poison, although these would seem to be unfounded. Summoned to Apulia, he died, July 15, at Castel di S. Giorgio; he was renowned as a hard drinker, and arriving there exhausted with heat he swallowed an enormous quantity of wine, then a copious supply of milk, and finished with cucumbers and vinegar. In forty-eight hours he was dead.[1]

In this jubilee we already find the beginning of a custom which in its development greatly increased the profitable results of these celebrations—granting the indulgence without requiring the pilgrimage to Rome. Hugh, King of Cyprus, petitioned for this favor, but it was refused him on the ground that other crowned heads had made similar applications and had been denied, yet the next year it was granted to him, to Edward III., to Henry, Duke of Lancaster, and to the queens Isabella of France, Philippa of England, and Elizabeth of Hungary. These were doubtless gratuitous, though unquestionably they must have been royally rewarded, and also gratuitous was the communication of the indulgence, in 1351, to those attending the general chapter of the Augustinians in Bâle, nor is it likely that they were the only friars thus favored. More suggestive of the desire for lucre was the authorization given to the Archbishop of Brindisi, nuncio to Sicily, to extend the same favor to thirty persons, provided they should pay what the pilgrimage to Rome would cost them, nor again is it probable that this was the only case.[2]

No statistics have reached us as to the money realized to the curia by this jubilee, but it must have been large, and was certainly looked after vigilantly. We have seen (Vol. II. p. 164) that the position of penitentiary for this occasion was not obtained without payment, that some of these officials were dismissed for peculation, and that there were doubtless large gains from the redemption of sins. The

[1] Vit. Nic. Laurentii Lib. III. Cap. 1, 2, 3 (Muratori Antiq. T. VII. pp. 876–8, 880–88).—Henrici Rebdorff Annal. ann. 1350 (Freher. et Struvii I. 631).—Raynald. ann. 1350, n. 3, 4.

[2] Raynald. ann. 1350, n. 2.—Matt. Neoburgens. (Alb. Argentinens.) ann. 1351 (Urstisii Germ. Hist. II. 156).

oblations at St. Peter's gave rise to a fierce quarrel between the canons, who seized them, and the *altararius*, or papal representative, who claimed them for his master. This was not settled until 1356, by Innocent VI., who allowed the canons to retain what they had seized, and to prevent unseemly disputes in future ordered a division; all vessels, vestments and ornaments suited to divine service should be allotted to the basilica; other articles and gold and silver bullion to the camera; all money was to be kept in the custody of the *altararius* and the four chamberlains of the chapter, to be divided five times a year, three-fourths of the net receipts to the camera and one-fourth to the canons to stimulate them to greater diligence in singing the offices.[1]

There were too many interests involved to permit the postponement for fifty years of so fruitful a source of profit, and when Gregory XI. returned from Avignon to Rome, in 1377, the citizens besought him to reduce the interval to thirty-three years. He is said to have listened favorably to their request, but his death, March 27, 1378, put an end to the project for a time.[2] The schism, which promptly broke out after the election of his successor, Urban VI., and the wandering state of the pope for some years precluded its resumption, but after Urban's return to Rome, towards the end of 1388, and the definition of party lines, he naturally recurred to it. Both he and his Roman subjects were in desperate need of money, and the proclamation of a jubilee was a strong appeal to Europe to recognize him as the true pope, rendering his possession of Rome a more imposing factor in

[1] Bullar. Vatican. I. 357. In the course of this affair Innocent VI., in a letter to his vicar at Rome, August 1, 1353, relates how the canons of St. Peter's forcibly took possession of the oblations and divided them among themselves, so that none reached the papal camera. Moreover they seized the property of pilgrims dying in Rome and asking for burial in the basilica. When Giovanni Castellani, the altararius, endeavored to exercise his functions they set upon him with cries "kill him who takes our oblations!", they pursued him to his house and attacked it with stones and missiles, so that he was obliged to take refuge elsewhere, after which they proceeded to divide the oblations as before, and contemptuously derided all attempts of the papal representatives to make them disgorge. The sacristan of the basilica endeavored to reason with them, when they gave him a beating in the choir.—Werunsky Excerpta ex Registt. Clement. VI. et Innoc. VI. p. 81 (Innsbruck, 1885).

[2] Valerius de Anno Sancto 1600, pp. lxviii.–ix.

the struggle. His bull was issued April 8, 1389, in which he advanced the thirty-three years of the life of Christ and the short duration of human life as the reasons for reducing the term to thirty-three years, though he did not condescend to explain how this comported with his indicating the solemnity for 1390. To the three churches—St. Peter's, St. Paul's and the Lateran—he added S. Maria Maggiore, with an apology which showed that this increase in the labor of the pilgrims was not expected to prove acceptable, and he took care to renew the regulations of Innocent VI. as to the division of the oblations.[1] Urban died October 15, 1389, and his successor, Boniface IX., inherited the enterprise. The schism kept away pilgrims from the lands of Avignonese obedience, but multitudes came from all parts of Italy and from Germany, Poland and Hungary, the most conspicuous arrival being Alberto of Ferrara at the head of a company of four thousand devotees, all uniformly and modestly clad.[2] If the event at Rome was not as productive as on previous occasions, Boniface utilized to the utmost the device of subsequent localized jubilees wherever he was acknowledged as the legitimate pope, and for years, as we have already seen (pp. 65, 182), his commissioners were busy in selling the pardons in one place after another, while the curia was bargaining over special concessions with cities and kingdoms which desired to share the profits.

It was vastly more productive to collect from penitents at home sums equivalent to what the pilgrimage would cost them than to have them come to Rome and trust to their penances and oblations. It is therefore not surprising that when the year 1400 arrived, and the people of the lands of Avignonese obedience, regarding the decree of Clement VI. as still in force, came flocking to Rome for the jubilee, Boniface resolutely discouraged them, even to the point of notifying them that no special indulgences were to be gained. In fact the mere coming to seek them was an implication that his de-

[1] Urbani PP. VI. Bull. *Salvator noster* (Amort, I. 84).—Theod. a Niem de Schismate Lib. I. Cap. 68.—Raynald. ann. 1389 n. 2.—Mag. Chron. Belgic. ann. 1389 (Pistorii et Struvii. I. 350).—Gobelini Personæ Cosmodrom. Æt. VI. Cap. 81.

The addition of S. Maria Maggiore to the churches had been decreed by Gregory XI.—Nich. PP. V. Bull. *Nonnulli* (Raynaldi ann. 1449 n. 15); Pauli PP. II. Bull. *Ineffabilis* (Bullar. I. 386).

[2] Vittorelli, Historia de' Giubilei, p. 217.

crees and those of Urban VI. were invalid, and as he chanced at the time to be in funds and not to be particularly well affected to the Roman populace, it is easy to understand his position. Still the impulse of the centennial year was too strong to be resisted and multitudes came from beyond the Alps, but robbers were busy along the roads and pestilence was busier still; only a portion of them reached Rome, and of these but few regained their homes.[1]

In 1420 Chicheley, Archbishop of Canterbury, whether moved, as Raynaldus says, by love of gain, or, as we may charitably hope, by inordinate zeal, proclaimed for his episcopal seat a jubilee with the same pardons as that of Rome. On hearing of it Martin V. interposed effectively, characterizing it as an unheard of presumption, an audacious sacrilege and an attempt to erect a false tabernacle of salvation in opposition to the Roman pontiff, to whom alone God had confided the power. His internuncio, the Bishop of Trieste, was ordered to suppress it, and Chicheley yielded.[2]

Martin V. observed the precept of Urban VI., and, in 1423, thirty-three years after that of Boniface IX., in 1390, he proclaimed one, though not without hesitation. The times, however, were not propitious for such demonstrations; England was preoccupied with the French war and France was almost in a state of anarchy, while Germany had its hands full with Hussite crusades and Hussite

---

[1] Bonifacii PP. IX. Bull. *Cum nonulli* (Vittorelli, p. 234).—Mag. Chron. Belgic. ann. 1400.—Th. a Niem de Schismate Lib. II. Cap. 28.—Raynald. ann. 1400, n. 1.—Meyeri Annal. Flandriæ Lib. XIV.—Naucleri Chronographia ann. 1400.—Philippi Bergomatis Suppl. Chronic. ann. 1400.

[2] Raynald. ann. 1423 n. 21. There were two other jubilees besides those of Rome. One was, and perhaps still is, celebrated at Compostella whenever the feast of Santiago (July 25) falls on a Sunday, a coincidence occurring during the present century in 1802, 1819, 1824, 1830, 1841, 1847, 1852, 1858 1869, 1875, 1880, 1886 and 1897. The other was at Lyons, under a papal concession of 1451, celebrated when the feast of St. John the Baptist falls on Trinity Sunday, which only occurs when Easter is on the latest possible day, April 25. This happened in 1451, 1546, and N. S. 1666, 1734 and 1886, and the next will be in 1943.—Zaccaria, Dell' Anno Santo, I. ix.

The jubilee of Compostella is based on a most impudent forgery of a bull *Regis æterni*, attributed to Alexander III., in 1179, in which he is made to recite that Calixtus II. granted it on the same conditions as the Roman jubilee, to which Alexander added plenaries every year on the feasts of St. James, of the translation of his remains and of the dedication of the church.—Potiti de Joriis Tract. de Suffragiis etc. P. IV. Q. XVII.

reprisals. Men's minds, also, were not attuned to it. In 1422 the agent of the Teutonic Order in Rome reports that people begin to talk of a jubilee, but most of the prelates deny that it will be proclaimed, though the Romans welcome the idea in the hope of gain. He suggests that precautions be taken to prevent people from coming to Rome and carrying money out of the land, for those who want a holy year had much better seek it by attacking the heretics or helping those who do so, as they will find in this much more grace.[1] In the same spirit John Gerson computed that in making ten miles a day on foot fifty days would be consumed in reaching Rome; a week spent there and fifty days in the return make fifteen weeks. Then he proposes that the penitent shall say ten Paters a day—one for each mile—then for seven days visit seven churches a day and forgive his enemies, and resume the ten Paters daily for the return. If he is able, let him give to the poor the equivalent of the travelling expenses, and whoso will do this will gain more pardon than most of those visiting the jubilee.[2] Under these influences the jubilee was naturally a failure—so much so, indeed, that the contemporary writers take no notice of it, and its existence has been doubted or denied, but it did take place.[3]

When the year 1450 came around it was convenient to return to the computation of Clement VI. and celebrate the half-century. Rome had triumphed over the councils, the wars which had convulsed central and western Europe were virtually over, and Christendom precipitated itself upon the holy city. All accounts agree that the crowd of pilgrims was unprecedented; to relieve it Nicholas V. reduced the stay required of strangers sometimes to five days, sometimes to three, and even to two. On December 19, on the occasion of the exhibition of the Veronica, the crowd on the Bridge of Adrian was so dense that a mule ridden by Cardinal Piero Barbo (afterwards Paul II.) was wedged fast and commenced kicking, killing many, while others were precipitated into the river; the dead were estimated at two hundred, and the mule and three horses were

[1] Joh. Voight, Stimmen aus Rom (v. Raumer's Taschenbuch, 1833, p. 138).

[2] Jo. Gersonis Modus quidam de Jubilæo (Ed. 1502, T. IV. lxx. Y).

[3] Pauli PP. II. Bull. *Ineffabilis* § 5 (Bullar. I. 386).—Weigel Claviculæ Indulgent. Cap. 19.—Amundesham Annal. Monast. S. Albani, I. 143, 152 (M. R. Series).—Felicis Hemmerlin Recapitulatio de anno jubileo, q 2.—Pastor, Geschichte der Päpste seit dem Augsgang des Mittelalters, I. 693.

crushed. Nicholas in consequence tore down houses to widen the passage and built two small churches in memory of the slain. As a financial success the jubilee was unexampled. Not only did the pilgrims bring infinite gold and silver for their oblations, but Nicholas astutely raised the *octroi* on provisions, which, added to the enormous consumption, brought him in large sums. The stock of gold thus obtained was so great that he struck a coin known as the jubilee, of unusual size, equal to three ordinary gold pieces; he ornamented Rome with buildings, purchased rare Greek and Latin codices, and called around him and pensioned learned scholars, for he was a patron of the New Learning. At his death, in 1455, these MSS. amounted to five thousand, and, as we are told, they would have increased had he lived longer, for not only were they daily brought to him, but he sent all over Europe, as far as Britain, in search of them.[1] He could afford thus to gratify his tastes, for he imitated Boniface IX. in prolonging the harvest by instituting local jubilees everywhere, either through his legates, or, as we have seen (p. 182), by selling concessions to bishops and reserving half the proceeds.[2]

So lucrative a result naturally excited impatience for its repetition, resulting in another abbreviation of the interval. Accordingly, in 1470, Paul II. reduced the term to twenty-five years and proclaimed in advance a jubilee for 1475. Dying in 1471, he left it to his successor, Sixtus IV., who confirmed his action and carried it into execution. Great preparations were made for the expected concourse; the old Janicular bridge which was popularly known as the *ponte rotto*, on account of its ruinous condition, was rebuilt and renamed the Sistine, and the streets were cleaned, straightened and repaired. The result however did not correspond to the expectation, for the number of pilgrims was small, in spite of a novel device, which serves as an additional evidence that the sole object of the jubilee was financial and not spiritual profit. Sixtus, in his con-

[1] Jannotii Manetti Vit. Nich. V. Lib. II. (Muratori III. II. 924).—Platinæ Vit. Nich. V.—Raynald. ann. 1449, n. 15; ann. 1450, n. 4.—Prosperi Lambertini Discorso, Foligno 1721, p. 60.—Illescas, Historia Pontifical y Catolica, Lib. VI. Cap. xiv.—Hemmerlin tells us (Recapitulatio de anno jubileo) that, as soon as twilight fell, the Romans and pilgrims plundered the corpses of those who perished on the Bridge of Adrian.

[2] Mag. Chron. Belgic. ann. 1451.—Chron. S. Ægidii in Brunswig, ann. 1451. —Amort de Indulg. I. 87–91.

firmatory bull, suspended all other indulgences, with the candid admission that this was for the purpose of increasing the afflux of pilgrims to Rome[1]—a provision retained by his successors, and leading, as we shall see, to many doubtful questions and much discussion. As though to emphasize his worldly motive, he manifested no such desire as respects pilgrims unable to contribute oblations, for when the Franciscans represented to him that the concourse of their brethren to Rome would diminish divine service at home and impoverish the Ara Cœli, which would have to entertain them, and, moreover, that many would wander off and never return, he promptly granted the jubilee indulgence to all Franciscans, conditioned merely on the performance of certain religious exercises.[2]

The ill-success of this jubilee has led some authorities to assert that Sixtus transferred it, May 1, to Bologna for a year, the visits being paid to the churches of St. Peter, St. Petronius, St. Stephen, and St. Francis, but Olimpio Ricci says that this has arisen from the misreading of a bull of Sixtus, granting the indulgence to all visiting those churches for three days between the Saturday before the first Sunday in Lent and the octave of Easter, and making certain specified payments, viz.: four gold florins by archbishops, bishops and nobles down to counts, three florins by abbots and barons, two florins by lesser nobles and doctors, and one florin by all others.[3] This was probably a favor generally extended, for Zaccaria prints a similar bull granted to Benevento for the kingdom of Naples, conditioned on similar payments, except when the penitents are too poor; the proceeds to be divided, one-third to the fabric of the four designated churches and two-thirds to the papal camera.[4]

There were great expectations for the centennial year 1500, but

---

[1] Pauli PP. II. Bull. *Ineffabilis*, 1470 (Amort, I. 91).—Sixti PP. IV. Bull. *Quemadmodum* (Cap. 4 Extrav. Commun. Lib. v. Tit. ix.).—Onuph. Panvin. in Vit. Sixti IV.—Raynald. ann. 1475, n. 1.—Vita Sixti IV. (Muratori, S. R. I. III. II. 1064, 1066).—Chr. Lupi de Indulg. Cap. ix.

[2] Chron. Glassburger ann. 1473 (Quaracchi, 1887, p. 437).

[3] Raynald. loc. cit.—Van Ranst Opusc. de Indulg. p. 75.—Ricci, Dei Giubilei Universali, pp. 61–3.

[4] Sixti PP. IV. Bull. *Pastoris æterni*, 28 Dec. 1475 (Zaccaria, Dell' Anno Santo, I. 194–205). Vittorelli (Historia de' Giubilei, p. 317) alludes to another brief, *Pastoris æterni*, granting the indulgence to the members of the royal house of Castile, on the recital of a certain number of Paters and Aves.

the attendance was small owing to the wars and pestilence,[1] and the occasion is chiefly memorable through the initiation of the ceremony of commencing the celebration by the opening of the *porte sante*—breaches made in the side-walls of the churches through which the pope enters St. Peter's and designated cardinals the other churches, on Christmas eve, to inaugurate the solemnity. This, which subsequently became one of the most impressive portions of the proceedings, appears to have been invented on this occasion by Alexander VI., who announced that he would with his own hands open the door in St. Peter's, provided for every hundredth year, and would depute cardinals for the others. It apparently was expected to be an attractive feature of the ceremony, and there seems to have been a tradition that a walled-up door existed in St. Peter's, but when Alexander sent his master of the ceremonies Burchard to find it, no trace of it could be discovered, and one had to be prepared in haste.[2]

---

[1] Philippi Bergomat. Suppl. Chronic. ann. 1500.—He is probably better authority than Paul Lang (Chron. Citizens. ann. 1500), who describes the concourse as immense.

[2] Alex. PP. VI. Bull *Inter curas multiplices* (Amort, I. 95).—Zaccaria, I. 153–4.—There is a phrase in Hemmerlin's *Dyalogus de anno jubileo*, written in advance of the jubilee of 1450, which may refer to the *porte sante*, but which seems rather to be a metaphorical allusion to the admission of the penitent to grace—"ad Romæ portam auream quæ operietur in nostræ jubilationis solemnitatem apud Sanctum Johannem Lateranensem et beati Petri principis apostolorum basilicam pro nunc prout per quinquaginta annos steterat muris firmissimis obstructa."

Manni (Istoria degli Anni Santi, p. 101) gives a copy of a medal with the head of Alexander VI. on the obverse, and on the reverse the pope opening the *porta santa* with the legend "Reseravit et clausit Ann. Jub. M. D."—though he says it may not be contemporary. This was subsequently a favorite device for the medals struck on these occasions.

This ceremony of opening the *porte sante* grew in time to be an impressive observance to which great symbolical significance was attached (Olimpio Ricci, Dei Giubilei Universali, pp. 5–17; Phœbei de Anno Jubilæi P. I. Cap. x.). Their opening and closing indicated the commencement and end of the jubilee, though Bianchi tells us (Foriero dell' Anno Santo, pp. 307–8) that it is only a solemnity and not essential to the gaining of the pardon, for, in 1625, Urban VIII. closed the *porta santa* on Christmas eve, though the jubilee continued until January 1. Clement VII. was the first to use the silver-gilt hammer, known as the golden hammer, three taps from which was the signal to the masons to remove the stones which had been loosened in advance. In 1650, at St. Paul's, the masons, mistaking the signal, threw down the door before the

Alexander evidently recognized promptly that the jubilee would prove a financial failure, and, with his customary readiness of resource, he hastened to make what he could by putting up for sale almost everything within the power of the keys. On March 4 he issued a bull announcing that his penitentiaries in the churches were empowered to reduce the days to be spent by foreign pilgrims to five and by Romans to seven, on the foreigners paying one-fourth and the residents one-eighth of the expenses thus saved to them, but to those absolutely penniless the reduction might be made gratuitously. On the same terms of one-eighth of the savings, Romans afraid to make the rounds on account of enmities, or too infirm to do so, could visit their parish churches, or, if unable to leave their homes, could earn the indulgence by Paters and Aves to be prescribed by the penitentiaries. These officials were further authorized to compound for "irregularity" in priests, except in cases of murder or bigamy; to dispense for incestuous marriages beyond the second degree, for payment proportioned to the station of the parties; to compound for unjust gains, the injured party being unknown, settling each case on its merits; also for vows, except those of Jerusalem, religion, and chastity; also for simony, on payment of one-third of the sums acquired by it; also with papal officials for charging illegal fees, on their paying a due proportion of the same. Altogether St. Peter's was converted into a market-place where pardons and dispensations were sold over the money chests in a manner which apparently did not shock the dulled moral sense of an age long and thoroughly educated to such chaffering. To wring the last penny from blunted consciences, on December 16, 1500, Alexander extended the time until Epiphany, and as the commissions of his penitentiaries had expired, he referred customers to the Observantine Vicar-General, Ludovico de la Torre, at the Ara Cœli.[1] As a matter of course, in

arrival of Cardinal Colonna, deputed to open it, and the crowd rushed in. The master of ceremonies promptly ordered it partially rebuilt, and it was taken down in due order (Ricci, *op. cit.* p. 259). Cf. Viva de Jubilæo ac Indulg. pp. 6, 7.—Van Ranst Opusc. de Indulg. p. 76.—Amort de Indulg. I. 123–4.—Zaccaria, Dell' Anno Santo, I. 153–4, 158.—In the jubilee of 1775 the *porte sante* were not opened until February 26, by Pius VI., in consequence of the death of Clement XIV. (Pii PP. VI. Const. *Summa Dei*, 25 Dec. 1775).

[1] Alex. PP. VI. Bull. *Cum in principio*, 4 Mart. 1500; Bull. *Commissum nobis*, 16 Dec. 1500 (Amort, I. 94, 102).

1501, he proceeded to gather in what he could throughout Europe, sending his legates everywhere and selling the indulgence for one-fifth of what the pilgrimage to Rome would cost. To England, for instance, was despatched a Spaniard named Gaspár Pons, who came to an understanding with the thrifty Henry VII. as to the royal share in the proceeds, and carried back a large sum to Rome. Altogether the industry was highly productive; Alexander said that the money was destined to a war which he proposed against the Turks, but no war was declared and Guicciardini is probably correct in saying that the proceeds were handed over to his son, Cæsar Borgia, then engaged in active war to extend his dominions.[1]

The jubilee of 1525 was naturally a failure; there was pestilence in Rome, the war between France and Spain filled southern Europe with confusion, while in Germany the Lutheran revolt and the peasants' war were quite sufficient distractions. Already, however, the purifying effect of the Reformation was beginning to show itself, for Raynaldus tells us that, to prevent Luther's objurgations, the clauses respecting money payments were omitted, and that, in place of a portion of the expenses of the pilgrimage, five Paters were substituted.[2]

The jubilee of 1550 was reasonably successful. Paul II. had proclaimed it in 1549, but he died November 10. His successor, Julius III., was not elected until February 8, 1550; he was crowned on the 22d, and opened the *porta santa* on the 24th.[3] When 1575 arrived the counter-Reformation was fully developed; the Church had recovered from the shock of the Reformation; it was no longer battling for its life, but was seeking to recover its lost ground; the

[1] Zaccaria, Dell' Anno Santo, I. 206–7.—Vittorelli, Historia de' Giubilei, p. 334.—Polydori Virgilii Hist. Angl. Lib. XXVI. (Ed. 1651, pp. 771–2).—Guicciardini, Lib. VI. Cap. 1.

[2] Raynald. ann. 1525 n. 1, 3.—On July 23, 1525, Clement VII. wrote to the Duke of Lorraine congratulating him on a recent victory over the "Lutheran" peasants, and rewarding him by granting the same jubilee indulgence as that acquired by visiting Rome to him and his brothers and their families and the inhabitants of Nancy and to four thousand others to be selected by him and by the Archbishop of Trèves, on their visiting, contrite and confessed, four churches for fifteen days and giving money for pious works.—Balan, Monumenta Reformationis Lutheranæ, p. 495.

[3] Raynald. ann. 1550, n. 47–9.—Surii Comment. Rerum in Orbe gestarum ann. 1550.

council of Trent had defined its doctrine and perfected its organization; St. Pius V. had frowned upon "eleemosynary" indulgences, and voluntary oblations had again become the rule. The rejuvenated Church therefore made every effort to impress the world with the fervor of its faith and the abounding fulness of its capacity to meet the spiritual needs of man. In 1573 Gregory XIII. had commenced his preparations; on May 10, 1574, he executed the letters *Dominus ac Redemptor*, announcing the glad tidings, and these were published, according to custom, on Ascension day, May 20. On November 13 he suspended all plenary indulgences, except *in articulo*, and when, on Christmas eve, he opened the *porta santa*, it was in the presence of a crowd estimated at 300,000, in which six or eight men were crushed to death, while similar multitudes attended the simultaneous ceremonies at the three other churches. He gave his benediction with a plenary indulgence to all present, and this he repeated on nine feasts during the year and at the closing solemnities. The number of pilgrims was large. Fifty penitentiaries, commissioned to absolve for reserved cases, were constantly on duty at St. Peter's, thirty each at the Lateran and S. Maria Maggiore and nearly as many at St. Paul's, and yet penitents frequently had to wait eight or ten days to be heard. There was a universal effusion of charity and love. The Sodality of the Trinità, formed to offer hospitality to strangers, numbered thirty thousand members, many of them men and women of the highest rank, who served the tables and washed the feet of the pilgrims; no one was received who could not produce a certificate of confession from a penitentiary; Italians were allowed to stay from three to five days and Ultramontanes from twelve to fifteen, while the sick were cared for as long as was necessary. The records of the Sodality showed 144,963 pilgrims lodged and 21,000 sick in the hospital. Besides the Trinità, there were other associations performing the same work, and many houses and palaces were thrown open to all comers. The time for speculating on the pilgrims was past, and the accumulation, not of money, but of spiritual influence was henceforth to be the object of the Holy See. To the lodgers at the Trinità Gregory granted the special privilege that the indulgence should be gained by five visits to the churches, while confraternities which came to Rome in procession were released with a single round. The needs of the English Catholics were kindly provided for in the bull *Salvator noster*, of March 30, 1575. As they had no churches

to visit they were directed to perform such pious works as might be prescribed by their confessors; if they had no confessors they could gain the indulgence by fifteen recitals of the rosary or chaplet of the Virgin, after which any confessor could absolve them, even for the reserved cases of the *Cœna Domini*. So well pleased was Gregory with the result that he is said to have proposed to shorten to thirteen years the intervals between jubilees, but found himself unable to carry the project into effect.[1]

In the following year the jubilee was, as usual, extended over Europe, under regulations which have been substantially followed ever since. These contrast strongly with the money-getting devices of the pre-Reformation period and reflect the reforms which had been forced upon the Church. A period of three months was allowed for obtaining the indulgence; the bishops determined the amount of pious works to be performed, within the limits of visiting five churches for fifteen days to visiting one church once; the penitent was allowed a choice among approved confessors, and could be absolved even for the cases reserved in the *Cœna Domini*. There was nothing said about "alms," or compounding for illicit gains or dispensing for vows.[2]

The jubilee of 1575 marks the turn of the tide which reached high-water mark in that of 1600. Estimates of the influx of pilgrims on this occasion range from 1,200,000 to 3,000,000, but in the semi-official account by Cardinal Valerio the number is given at the more credible figure of 536,000. In August many confraternities came in procession; on account of the intense heat they visited the churches at night, but in spite of this most of them perished, carried to heaven, as the chronicler piously hopes, in the midst of their religious exercises. Many heretics who had been attracted by curiosity were converted at the sight of the popular enthusiasm, and the

[1] Theiner Annal. Eccles. ann. 1574, n. 41; ann. 1575, n. 1–12, 25; T. II. Mantissa Documentt. n. 1.—Vittorelli, Historia de' Giubilei, pp. 389, 395, 413, 415–16.—Zaccaria, Dell' Anno Santo, I. 149.—Olimpio Ricci, De' Giubilei Universali, pp. 79–98.

It is perhaps worthy of note that the contemporary Surius makes no reference to this jubilee, as though it were too insignificant an event to record. Zerola tells us (Tract. de Jubilæo, Lib. I. Cap. 9) that it was attended by very few from England, Scotland, France, Saxony, Germany and Bohemia.

[2] Gregor. PP. XIII. Const. *Dilectissimus;* Marquardi Augustani Litt. Pastoral. 28 Sept. 1576 (Amort, I. 104).—Vittorelli *op. cit.* p. 417.—Zaccaria, *op. cit.* I. 214–15.

humble zeal of Clement VIII. in washing the feet of pilgrims and his assiduity in celebrating mass and in personally hearing confessions—four hundred converts in all, according to some accounts, but Valerio gives the more probable number of fifty. It is evident from his recital that the population was wrought to a pitch of religious delirium not unlike that of a prolonged camp-meeting, but all the fiercer from the infectious enthusiasm of so vast a multitude crowded together.[1]

It is scarce worth while to follow in detail the subsequent jubilees of 1625, 1650, 1675, 1700, 1725, 1750, and 1775, which could teach us nothing except that in their greater or less success there was a gradual falling off in numbers and zeal. There was likewise a great reduction in the oblations of the pilgrims, and we may well believe Zaccaria's assertion that the proceeds were much less than the expenses. Every effort was made to lighten the burden of the pilgrims by offering them gratuitous shelter and food, no small share of which was necessarily contributed by the pope and the cardinals. In 1600 Clement VIII. thus gave 300,000 scudi; in 1650 Innocent X. took off six giulj per measure of the tax on corn. Since the sixteenth century we may fairly assume that every jubilee has been a not inconsiderable burden on the Holy See.[2] A not unnatural concomitant of this was an increased development of the spiritual features of the solemnity, which finds apt expression in the exhortation to repentance by Clement XIV. in 1774.[3]

The disturbances consequent on the French Revolution and the formation of the Roman Republic naturally prevented any formal proclamation of a jubilee in 1800; Pius VI. died August 29, 1799, and Pius VII. was not elected until March 14, 1800, by the cardinals who had found refuge in Venice. Yet no announcement is necessary, for the bull *Ineffabilis* of Paul II. is still in force, and until repealed the jubilee returns every twenty-five years, and the indulgences can be gained.[4] It may be questioned however whether,

---

[1] Valerii de Anno Sancto 1600, pp. xxv.–vi., xxxiv.–v., xxxix., lxxii.–lxxviii., xcii., xcv.—Zaccaria, Dell' Anno Santo, I. 95—Vittorelli, Historia de' Giubilei, pp. 109, 336.—Van Ranst Opusc. de Indulg. p. 70.—Polacchi Comment. in Bull. Urbani VIII. pp. 166–8.

[2] Zaccaria, II. 192–4.—Ricci, de' Giubilei Universali, pp. 104, 266.

[3] Clement. PP. XIV. Const. *Salutis nostræ* (Bullar. Contin. T. II. p. 716).

[4] Zaccaria, II. 2–4.

amid the strife of arms and the savagely reactionary occupation of Rome, in 1800, by the troops of Ferdinand of Naples, there were many pious souls to win the pardons. In the reaction which followed the fall of Napoleon, Leo XII. had the opportunity, in 1825, to preside over the celebration with all the ancient formalities, and a sufficient number of pilgrims were attracted, according to Cardinal Wiseman, who was an eye-witness, to exhaust the funds of the charitable institutions of Rome and leave the papal exchequer considerably in debt.[1] The revolutionary excitement of 1850 and the limitation, by 1875, of the papal possessions to the Vatican deprived Pius IX. of the unprecedented honor of presiding over two jubilees; all that he could do was to proclaim an indulgence *in forma jubilæi* on the 2d and 25th of July, 1850, and on the 24th of December, by his encyclical *Gravibus*, he offered the customary "plenissimam anni jubilæi omnium peccatorum suorum indulgentiam" to those who would for fifteen days visit the four churches in Rome, or elsewhere four churches to be designated by the bishops, and pray for the exaltation of the Holy See, the extirpation of heresy, the conversion of the erring, the peace and unity of Christian peoples and the intention of the pope.[2] This made the jubilee universal and simultaneous throughout the Catholic world; it was the same in 1875, and it is probable that this example will be followed by Leo XIII. in the year 1900.

Pius IX., in the jubilee of 1875, did not imitate his predecessors in suspending all other indulgences during the jubilee.[3] It is some-

[1] Leonis PP. XII. Constitt. 36, 67, 106, 107, 114 (Bullar. Contin. VIII. 64, 252, 339, 340, 351).—Jouhanneaud, Dict. des Indulgences, p. 262.

[2] Wetzer und Welte's Kirchenlexicon, VI. 1909.—Pii PP. IX. Acta VI. 351. In 1852 the question was discussed in the Congregation of Indulgences as to what should be done to gain the jubilee in places where there is but one church, and it was resolved to supplicate the pope to grant a general faculty to Ordinaries to order in such cases that the requisite number of visits should be paid to that church.—Decr. Authent. n. 654.

The visits can be made in a carriage, but there is more merit in performing them on foot.—Le Jubilé Universel de 1875, Toulouse, p. 22.

[3] There is no allusion to suspension in the Encyclical *Gravibus*, and no subsequent letters of suspension are printed in the *Acta*. This departure from former practice seems to have occasioned inquiry, for in some decisions by the Penitentiary, Jan. 25, 1875, there is one declaring "manere tamen in

what remarkable, indeed, that this arbitrary exercise of papal power had been persistently enforced since 1475, even up to the jubilee of Leo XII., in 1825, long after the financial motive which originally prompted it had ceased to be operative. It was a sore deprivation to the faithful and a severe infliction on the churches which looked to their indulgences for a notable portion of their revenues. To all these there must have been a flavor of bitter mockery in the exulting rhetoric of Urban VIII. announcing the jubilee of 1625—"All nations clap your hands, rejoice in God with the voice of exultation . . . we bring to you the tidings of the year approaching with the gifts of the King of Ages . . . the year of remission and pardon, the desirable time, the day of salvation." Then turning to the bishops he commands them: "Take the silver trumpets used in the jubilee, preach the word of God and announce to the peoples the great joy, that they may be sanctified, and with the help of God's grace be prepared to receive the celestial gifts which God, the giver of all good, has provided for the children of his love through our humble ministry."[1] It argues a deficient sense of humor in a pope to utter these lofty promises, knowing that in a few weeks he will follow them with another proclamation cutting off all competition and depriving the faithful of the consolations which they had been taught to regard as essential. Nor is the matter mended by the explanation of Polacchi, in his commentary on this bull, that the suspension is necessary in order to suppress competition, especially now when every church in the smallest towns is furnished with a plenary indulgence, nor by his quaint exhortation to the souls in purgatory to be patient during this year, and perhaps they may get the benefit of some of the overflowing mercies which abound in Rome.[2] It is not without reason that Dr. Amort remarks that if indulgences have the power to liberate sinners so easily from the necessity of satisfaction, their suspension during the jubilee is the greatest of evils, and the Holy Year ought not to be called the year of jubilee, but the year of grief and sorrow,[3] and the force of this is

---

suo vigore Indulgentias a Sancta Sede concessas et expresse non suspensas aut revocatas."—Acta, T. VII. p. 2.

[1] Urbani PP. VIII. Bull. *Omnes gentes*, 29 Apr. 1624.

[2] Polacchi Comment. in Bullam Urbani PP. VIII. pp. 104, 345.

[3] Amort de Indulgent. II. 211.

This device of suspending indulgences for the benefit of some favored in-

illustrated by the statement of Pignatelli, that in Rome the ordinary indulgences of the churches enable a man to gain a plenary every day, while during the Holy Year he can gain only the jubilee.[1] In fact, when we consider the arbitrary wantonness with which successive popes varied these suspensions, and the persistent vagueness which left unsettled questions of the deepest import to believers, it would seem a reproach to assume that they had any real belief in the power over the quick and the dead with which they thus trifled.

When Sixtus IV. commenced the practice he suspended only plenary indulgences granted by the Holy See to churches and other institutions and confraternities, with the exception of the churches of Rome, and decreed that the suspension should continue during the good pleasure of himself and the Holy See.[2] This phraseology was followed by succeeding popes up to the jubilee of 1575, when Gregory XIII. included in the suspension all plenaries granted to individuals and to religious orders. Clement VIII., in 1600, went still further and by omitting the word "plenary" and including images, medals, beads etc., he annulled, for the time, all indulgences whatsoever; even those of the Roman churches were not excepted. Urban VIII. used virtually the same formula, and this became habitual with his

terest was not confined to the jubilee. It was done by Julius II. to stimulate the sale of the St. Peter's indulgence, and was continued by Leo X., Clement VII., and Paul III. (Julii PP. II. Bull. *Liquet omnibus* § 20; Pauli PP. III. Const. *Dum ad universas, ap.* Bullar. I. 502. 751). Perhaps, however, the most vicious measure of the kind was an indulgence granted, in 1514, by Leo X. to the church of Xaintes to raise money for repairs, which contained a suspension of all other indulgences in France, and must have cost the grantees heavily. The Parlement, in assenting to the preaching of this pardon, required that the indulgences of the Hôtel-Dieu of Paris be excepted from the suspension; the Bishop of Xaintes was within three months to obtain from Leo a bull to this effect, and meanwhile none of the money obtained by the sale was allowed to reach his hands (Preuves des Libertez de l'Église Gallicane, II. 145).

[1] Pignatelli, Il Giubileo dell' Anno Santo, p. 302.

[2] "Omnes et singulas plenarias, etiam ad instar Jubilæi . . . a nobis et eadem Sede vel illius auctoritate quibuscumque ecclesiis, monasteriis etc. quomodolibet concessas . . . usque ad nostrum et ejusdem Sedis beneplacitum suspendimus, illasque durante beneplacito nostro et Sedis prædictæ suspensas esse volumus, nec interim alicui suffragari: indulgentiis tamen Basilicarum et Ecclesiarum dictæ urbis in suo plenario robore durantibus."—Cap. 4 Extravagant. Commun. Lib. v. Tit. ix.

successors.[1] The suspension of the partial indulgences which existed everywhere in such profusion, and which by this time were connected with nearly all devotional exercises not of prescription, was a very serious matter; it was a violent upturning of habits and thoughts that were well-nigh universal, and if indulgences had the value attached to them it was a thing not to be lightly undertaken or to be in any way left in doubt. Yet it has always seemed almost impossible for a papal document to be so phrased that the ingenuity of theologians could not find in it a doubtful or a double sense, or argue away any specially obnoxious clause, and it was so in this case. Even before the time of Clement VIII. there were doctors who held that the suspension of plenaries included partials, and after him the majority of moralists persuaded themselves that the sweeping clauses of the bulls of suspension did not suspend partial indulgences. There was a legal maxim much used by the laxer schools—*odiosa sunt restringenda et favorabilia amplianda*—which was brought to bear, and it was proved that the papal utterances did not mean what they said.[2] There would have been no difficulty in framing an absolute clause which should settle the question on one side or the other, yet

---

[1] Zaccaria, Dell' Anno Santo II. 54.—Clement. PP. VIII. Litt. *Cum Sancti*, 21 Maii, 1599 (Bullar. III. 85).—Urbani PP. VIII. Bull. *Cum nuper*, 2 Maii, 1624 (Bullar. V. 45).—Innoc. PP. X. Bull. *Cum nuper*, 6 Maii, 1649 (Bullar. V. 465).—Phœbei de Orig. et Progressu anni Jubilæi, p. 235 (Romæ, 1675).—Bianchi, Foriero dell' Anno Santo, p. 358 (Roma, 1700).—Bened. PP. XIII. Bull. *Cum nos nuper*, 6 Julii, 1724 (Bullar. XIII. 107).

[2] Azpilcuetæ Comment. de Jubilæo, Notab. XXV. n. 1, 2; XXXIII. n. 6.—Gratiano, Del Giubileo dell' Anno Santo, P. I. Cap. 13 (Roma, 1599, p. 120).—Zerola Tract. de Jubilæo ac Indulg. Lib. II. Cap. 19.—Lavorii de Jubilæo et Indulg. P. I. Cap. x. n. 5, 6.—Polacci Comment. in Bull. Urbani VIII. pp. 345–6 (Romæ, 1625).—Pasqualigo Theoria et Praxis Jubilæi, Q. 144 (Romæ, 1650).—Quarti, Trattato del Giubileo, p. 193 (Roma, 1650).—Phœbei de Orig. et Progressu Anni Jubilæi P. I. Cap. 15 (Romæ, 1675).—Pignatelli, Il Giubileo dell' Anno Santo, pp. 292–3, 298 (Roma, 1700).—Viva de Jubilæo ac Indulg. p. 47 (Ed. 1750).—Theod. a Spiritu Sancto Tract. de Jubilæo Cap. XII. § ii. n. 2.

Bianchi (Foriero dell' Anno Santo, Roma, 1700, pp. 313, 360–1) argues in favor of the suspension of partials. He says that Clement X. (1675) declared that his intention was that partials as well as plenaries should be suppressed and that Innocent XII. wished that there should be none of any kind but the jubilee to be had. See also Van Ranst, Opusc. de Indulg. pp. 83–4. Benedict XIV. alludes to the doubt which had long hung over this question and the controversy which it had occasioned (Encyc. *Inter præteritos* § 22).

pope after pope continued to use the disputed formula, knowing the discussion which it provoked and the doubts which hung over the question. It was not until the jubilee of 1750 that Benedict XIV. settled the matter by the simple expression of "plenary and not plenary" and by enumerating the exceptions which he permitted.[1]

As a matter of course the more powerful bodies affected by these suspensions struggled hard to escape the loss. The cruzada, which was a perennial source of income to the Spanish government, was assumed to be a contract between the Holy See and those proposing to engage in the holy war with the Turks, which could not be broken; sometimes the popes conceded the claim and sometimes they did not, but all the same the cruzada continued to be preached and paid for without interruption during jubilee years.[2] The Jesuits claim that

[1] Bened. PP. XIV. Bull. *Cum nos nuper*, 17 Maii, 1749 (Bullar. III. 63).

The exceptions enumerated by Benedict XIV. are copied, with some changes, from the regulations of Benedict XIII. for the jubilee of 1725, and were substantially followed by his successors. They consist of indulgences *in articulo mortis*, privileged altars, and indulgences applicable to the dead, those obtainable *toties quoties* by visiting churches in which the forty hours' prayers are going on, those for accompanying or causing to be accompanied with lights the sacrament when carried to the sick, those for the Angelus, and those granted by legates and bishops when officiating. See Clement. PP. XIV. Const. *Cum Nos nuper*, 1774 (Bullar. Contin. V. 724) and Bouvier, *Traité des Indulgences*, p. 406.

[2] In 1824 Leo XII. waived the suspension of the cruzada as a special grace (Decret. Authent. n. 451). For earlier discussions on the subject see Rodriguez, Bolla della Crociata, pp. 249–50; Summa Diana s. v. *Bulla Cruciatæ* n. 93; Lavorii de Jubileo P. I. Cap. x. n. 10; Quarti, Trattato del Giubileo, p. 210; Pignatelli, Il Giubileo dell' Anno Santo, p. 296; Bianchi, Foriero dell' Anno Santo, p. 364; Zaccaria, Dell' Anno Santo, II. 62, 68, 70; Theod. a Spiritu Sancto *loc. cit.* n. 3.

The cruzada suspended all other indulgences in the Spanish dominions, even those for St. Peter's (Rodriguez, Bolla della Crociata, p. 236). The Commissioner-General of the Cruzada, however, could license others to be sold to those who had already taken the cruzada (Summa Diana s. v. *Bulla Cruciatæ* n. 92). In 1563 the Venetian envoy at Madrid reports that a certain hospital had given 4000 ducats for such a licence and had cleared 180,000 from it (Relazioni Venete, Serie I. T. V. p. 24). To enforce this required strict regulation of the beggary of the religious Orders, which was so generally connected with indulgences to stimulate the liberality of the people, but, in 1510, the Commissioner of the Cruzada conceded that alms might be given to them, provided the giver did not believe that he thereby gained an indulgence (Pragmaticas y altres Drets de Cathalunya, Lib. I. Tit. ix. Cap. 1. Cf. Recopilacion de las

in 1550, Julius III. excepted their Society from the suspension of the jubilee, but I think this doubtful.[1] The Franciscans made a persistent struggle for the exemption of their favorite indulgence of the Portiuncula of Assisi, claiming that the suspension was only of papal indulgences, while this was granted directly by Christ. Sometimes they succeeded in getting special letters or declarations in its favor and sometimes they failed; Benedict XIV. did not include it among the exceptions, but Clement XIV., as a good Franciscan, did, while Leo XII. followed Benedict's example.[2] There were other prominent beneficiaries of indulgences—Compostella, the Holy Sepulchre, Loreto, the Seven Churches of Rome, the Scala Santa etc.—which fought hard for exemption, and sometimes succeeded, according as one or another could bring influence and pressure to bear, creating endless confusion and rendering the subject one in which the most earnest believer might well feel in doubt as to the validity of the remission which he might gain.

Indias Lib. I. Tit. xxi.). In modern times the faculty of suspending other indulgences is not conceded to the commissioner in the bulls granting the cruzada (Sanchez, Expositio Bullæ S. Cruciatæ, pp. 118, 409–10). Yet as lately as 1840 the Archbishop of Tarragona, having obtained a number of faculties for granting plenaries, became apprehensive of the claims of the Commissioner of the Cruzada to interfere with him and applied to the Congregation of Indulgences to know what he should do, when the answer was that he could use the faculties privately, in a manner not to cause scandal, and must not print them without the Commissioner's permission (Decr. Authentica n. 523).

[1] Stewart Rose, St. Ignatius Loyola and the early Jesuits, p. 467.—I can find no trace of such a grant. On the contrary, when, in 1549, Paul III. conceded the enormous privileges of a plenary once a year to all visiting a Jesuit church on a day fixed by the General, and seven years and quarantines for visits on all Fridays, Sundays, days in Lent and four feasts of Christ, he expressly excluded the jubilee year.—Pauli PP. III. Bull. *Licet debitum* (Literæ Apostolicæ Soc. Jesu, Antverpiæ, 1635, pp. 49–50).

[2] Zaccaria, Dell' Anno Santo, II. 63, 68.—Pignatelli, Il Giubileo dell' Anno Santo, p. 297.—Viva de Jubilæo ac Indulg. p. 50.—Bianchi, Foriero dell' Anno Santo, pp. 314–15, 365.—Van Ranst Opusc. de Indulg. pp. 88–9.—Clement. PP. XIV. Bull. *Cum nos nuper*, 1774 (Bullar. Contin. V. 725).—Leonis PP. XII. Bull. *Cum nos nuper*, 1824 (Ibid. VIII. 84).

The shrine of Our Lady of Einsiedlen made a similar claim of exception on the ground that its indulgence was of divine origin (Amort, II. 194), apparently forgetful of its forgery, ascribed to Leo VIII., in 964 (See p. 135), but I can find no trace of its ever having been considered.

There was a more disquieting question, which illustrates the extreme carelessness pervading the whole of this business. When Sixtus IV. first suspended indulgences he did not specify that the suspension was for the jubilee year, but during his good pleasure and that of the Holy See. It was a recognized rule of legal construction that under this formula a decree remains in force until it is formally revoked by the proper authority, but neither Sixtus nor his successors took the trouble to issue a revocation.[1] From this it followed that, after 1474, all plenary indulgences, excepting new ones up to the time of the succeeding jubilee, remained suspended, and that those who paid for them and relied upon them, for themselves and for the souls of their kindred in purgatory, were miserably deceived. Curiously enough, this escaped attention for a century, until Azpilcueta noticed it, when studying the subject prior to the jubilee of 1575. He held his opinion in suspense until he could consult the papal datary, who could only say that Sixtus IV. had never revoked his suspension nor had it been tacitly assumed that a revocation was implied by the expiration of the jubilee year; further, that Gregory XIII. would not issue any formal revocation, nor would it be assumed that a revocation effected itself when the jubilee year expired; it was probable that Sixtus had renewed individual indulgences at the request of those concerned; that Gregory would do the same, and it would be well for all who were interested in indulgences to make application for their renewal.[2] The papacy shrank from confessing to the world the absurd blunder which it admitted having made, and preferred that the faithful should go on deceiving themselves with invalid pardons. S. Carlo Borromeo accepted the situation, and on February 4, 1576, instructed his parish priests not to publish plenary indulgences or expose the tablets on which they were inscribed, for

[1] Alex. VI., in announcing his jubilee in 1498, suspended all indulgences from Resurrection 1498 (April 15) to the close of 1500.—Bull. *Consueverunt*, 12 Apr. 1498 (Bullar. Vatican. III. 282). When, in December, 1500, he extended the jubilee throughout Italy, he suspended indulgences until Pentecost, 1501.—Bull. *Pastoris aterni*, 9 Dec. 1500 (Amort, I. 100). Clement VII., in 1525, simply suspended indulgences without specifying any term.—Bull. *Inter solicitudines*, 23 Dec. 1524 (Amort, I. 102). In 1575 Gregory XIII. returned to the Sixtine formula, suspending them during the pleasure of the Holy See (Theiner Annal. Eccles. ann. 1574, n. 41).

[2] Azpilcueta Comment. de Jobilæo, Notab. XXVIII. XXXIII. Cf. Theod. a Spiritu Sancto Tractatus Cap. XII. § 1, n. 5–8.

the prohibition and suspension were still in force.[1] Clement VIII. and his successors were a trifle less stubborn than Gregory XIII., and altered the phraseology of their bulls of suspension so as to limit it to the jubilee year,[2] but they would not revoke the suspensions of the earlier popes, so the doubt remained unsolved with regard to all indulgences older than 1575. About 1675 an effort was made to cut the knot. Cardinal Ricci, then Abate Ricci and secretary of the Congregation of Indulgences, submitted to that body the question whether the suspension decreed in 1575 by Gregory XIII. was still in force. After debate the characteristically evasive decision was reached that it was not, but that for abundant caution the pope should be asked to revoke it.[3] Benedict XIV. was the first pontiff who had the courage to allude to the subject. He treats the view of Azpilcueta with respect, but argues that successive popes looked on without interfering while pious men offered these indulgences and printed them in books, though at the same time they prohibited apocryphal indulgences and announced those which had been revoked, and that this sufficed for his predecessors and himself to be satisfied with limiting their suspensions to the jubilee year.[4]

The most arbitrary and wanton exercise of this power of suspension was, however, in relation to indulgences for the dead. When Sixtus IV. introduced the device for his jubilee of 1475, the power of granting remissions to souls in purgatory was, as we shall see hereafter, merely a speculative question which had not been essayed in practice. He therefore made no exceptions in favor of such indulgences, and his successors followed his formulas, although this branch of the business of issuing pardons had developed with great rapidity, and had become, perhaps, its most important portion. Sixtus went as far as his power at the time extended, suspending all plenaries, whether in life or *in articulo mortis*, in whatever way or

---

[1] Zaccaria, Dell' Anno Santo, II. 58.—Theod. a Sp. Sancto, *ubi sup.* n. 9.

[2] Zaccaria, II. 62.—Polacci Comment. in Bull. Urbani VIII. Append.—Ruggieri Diario dell' Anno Santo, 1650, p. 8.—Phœbei de Orig. et Prog. Anni Jubilæi, p. 235.—Bianchi, Foriero dell' Anno Santo, p. 359.

[3] Zaccaria, II. 60.—For a discussion of the subject see Quarti, *Trattato del Giubileo*, pp. 212–13.

[4] Bened. PP. XIV. Encyc. *Inter præteritos*, §§ 19–21, 3 Dec. 1749 (Bullar. III. 83–4). The ninety-one sections of this long document show how intricate and puzzling were the questions to which the jubilee gave rise.

for whatever cause conceded or that might be conceded in future,[1] thus rapaciously and cruelly denying to the dying sinner whatever consolation he might find in the indulgence promised him by the certificate which he had bought and paid for. Alexander VI. repeated this in the jubilee of 1500, in which for the first time release was promised to souls in purgatory for whose benefit the due amount should be paid, and he made no exception of the suspension in favor of indulgences for the dead.[2] It was the same in the bull of Julius II. for St. Peter's, which was applicable to the dead, and suspended all other indulgences.[3] Clement VII., in 1525, did not make his jubilee applicable to the dead, but he adopted the formula of Sixtus IV., and thus suspended all indulgences for their benefit.[4] It was the same in the jubilees of 1550 and 1575. In that of 1600 Clement VIII. made the suspension more extended and precise than his predecessors and introduced no exception in favor of souls in purgatory, but Ricci says that he offered a special concession by which pilgrims making four visits to the churches could gain an indulgence applicable to the dead, and that Urban VIII. prolonged his jubilee through the last week of December, 1625, during which a single round of the churches gained an indulgence similarly applicable.[5] This was but a very slender substitute for the innumerable privileged altars and other provisions for the relief of the souls in purgatorial fires, for the doctors hold that the jubilee indulgence is not applicable to the dead unless specially provided for in the jubilee bull, and Zaccaria tells us that no pope since Alexander VI. has made such provision.[6] The question as to what was the condition of the ordinary indulgences for the dead, under the suspension, seems to have been very uncertain during the seventeenth century, and to have much puzzled the theologians, who sought eagerly for some mode of excepting them from the suspensions which

---

[1] "In vita seu in mortis articulo, quovis modo aut quavis causa quomodolibet concessas et concessa, et in posterum forsitan concedendas."—Extrav. Commun. Lib. v. Tit. x. Cap. 4.

[2] Alex. PP. VI. Bull. *Pastoris æterni* (Amort, I. 99–100).

[3] Julii PP. II. Bull. *Liquet omnibus* (Bullar. I. 502).

[4] Raynald. ann. 1525, n. 2.

[5] Clement. PP. VIII. Litt. *Cum Sancti* (Bullar. III. 85).—Ricci, Dei Giubilei Universali, pp. 135, 256.

[6] Zaccaria, Dell' Anno Santo, II. 21–22.

followed each other at each succeeding Holy Year with pitiless exactitude of uniformity.[1] Polacchi reports that Clement VIII. and Urban VIII. both verbally declared that they did not intend to include them in the suspension, and Bianchi even asserts that Urban issued a decree to this effect, which was acquiesced in by his successors.[2] If this were so, it would have settled the question; that it was not so is proved by the arguments of Lavorio and Pasqualigo to solve the current doubts. They make no allusion to any papal utterances, but prove that, as regards indulgences *in articulo mortis*, the dying sinner has a right in common law of which he is not to be deprived, while as respects those for the dead they are not to be held to be suspended because they do not affect the primal cause of the suspension, which is to attract pilgrims to Rome—all of which shows the straits to which the theologians were reduced to evade the plain purport of the papal decrees.[3] All theologians, however, were not so easily satisfied, for Laymann asserts as an indubitable fact that indulgences *in articulo* are suspended.[4] The pressure at length became too great. Privileged altars, a mass at which liberates a soul from purgatory, were multiplying everywhere, especially in the churches of the religious orders, and the fees formed a source of revenue, the deprivation of which, even for the term of the Holy Year, was unpleasant. Clement X., in 1674, Innocent XII., in 1699, and Benedict XIII., in 1724, issued their decrees of suspension after the fashion of their predecessors, and subsequently each made a compromise declaring that they did not intend to interfere with indulgences *in articulo* or those for the dead procurable by masses at privileged altars, or by the mass of St. Gregory, etc., but only

---

[1] Urbani PP. VIII. Bull. *Cum nos nuper* ann. 1624 (Bullar. V. 45).—Innoc. PP. X. Bull. *Cum nos nuper*, ann. 1649 (Ib. p. 465).—Clement. PP. X. Bull. *Cum nos nuper*, 1674 (Bullar. XI. 95).—Innoc. PP. XII. Bull. *Cum nos nuper*, 1699 (Pignatelli, Il Giubileo dell' Anno Santo, p. lxiii.).

[2] Polacchi Comment. in Bull. Urbani VIII. p. 352.—Bianchi, Foriero dell' Anno Santo, pp. 318–19.

[3] Lavorii de Jubileo P. I. Cap. x. n. 14–18.—Pasqualigo Theoria et Praxis Jubilæi Q. 150, 152.

Lavorio relates that in the jubilee of 1600 the Roman penitentiaries were of this opinion, but he was not relieved from doubts in consequence of hearing of a great personage who begged the pope to allow some indulgences for his dead kindred to be excepted, which Clement refused.

[4] Layman Theol. Moral. Lib. v. Tract. vii. Cap. 8, n. 3.

suspended those which were gained by individuals and applied to the dead.[1] This satisfied the priests, whose functions during the Holy Year were the only channel through which sorrowing survivors could mitigate the sufferings of their dear ones in purgatory. At length Benedict XIV., in his regulations for the celebration of 1750, had the courage to put an end to this disgraceful feature of the jubilee and to except from the suspension all indulgences for the dead, whether gained by privileged altars directly or by individuals, and applied to a soul in purgatory.[2] Subsequent pontiffs wisely followed his example.

The suppression of competing indulgences does not explain the crowds which thronged the Roman streets while jubilees were yet in their prime, for the most successful celebrations were those which occurred before Sixtus IV. invented this form of coercion. It is difficult, in fact, to account for the eagerness of the faithful to gain the jubilee, or for the fervid rhetoric with which successive popes announced it as the year of salvation, unless by the supposition that there was a wide-spread popular belief, encouraged by the curia, that in some way the jubilee indulgence was more efficacious than others, although these others were in their turn represented as infallible. After Boniface IX., as we have seen, the jubilee was carried to every quarter of Europe, brought to the doors of sinners and sold for a half or a fourth or a fifth of what the toilsome and protracted pilgrimage to Rome would cost, and yet men and women by the hundred thousand precipitated themselves upon the holy city as though secure of earning not merely a release from purgatory, but salvation itself. There is no difference between the ordinary plenary remission and that offered in the jubilee, sufficient to explain this popular fervor. The superior advantages of the jubilee were only three—the choice of a confessor, absolution from reserved cases, and commutation of vows.[3] We have seen (I. p. 292) how highly

[1] Bianchi, Foriero dell' Anno Santo, p. 367.—Amort de Indulg. I. 122.—Bened. PP. XIII. Litt. *Decet Romanum* (Bullar. XIII. 143).

[2] Bened. PP. XIV. Bull. *Cum nos nuper*, 17 Maii, 1749 (Bullar. Bened. XIV. III. 64).

[3] Viva de Jubilæo ac Indulgentiis p. 1.—Bianchi, Foriero dell' Anno Santo, pp. 229–30.—Gröne, Der Ablass, p. 144.—Bouvier, Traité des Indulgences, p. 387.

prized, in the middle ages, was the privilege of choosing a confessor, but, with the multiplication of the Mendicants and the ease with which confessional letters were procured, this privilege became too common to render it specially attractive, and its importance has decreased with the relaxation of parochial jurisdiction in modern times. Reserved cases, also, are now so readily managed that they can scarce be regarded as conferring any great advantage on the jubilee, and even in earlier times they were scarce so frequent or so difficult of settlement as to explain the throngs of pilgrims to Rome. Indeed, these advantages do not absolutely require the pilgrimage, for Laymann informs us that a man intending *bona fide* to gain the jubilee can be absolved for reserved cases or have vows commuted, and then, if he changes his mind, culpably or inculpably, the absolution and commutation remain good.[1] Casuistic ingenuity, however, rendered the subject of commutation of vows more attractive to the sinner. No reason, we are told, is necessary to justify commutation; the jubilee itself is sufficient reason, and if they have been taken in view of commutation this is no impediment. It is true that a vow of perpetual chastity or of religion cannot be commuted, but a vow of virginity is not a vow of chastity, nor is a vow to assume holy orders a vow of religion, and a vow to take a vow of

---

[1] Layman Theol. Moral. Lib. v. Tract. vii. Cap. 8, n. 9.

There has been some discussion whether episcopal reserved cases are included in the privileges of the jubilee, but it has been decided in favor of the papal power (Summa Diana s. v. *Jubilæum* n. 21.—Pasqualigo Theoria et Praxis Jubilæi Q. 232 n. 6.—Viva de Jubilæo ac Indulg. pp. 235–8), and, in 1875, Pius IX. specifically mentions them in his Encyclical *Gravibus* (Acta T. VI. p. 353).

The question whether heresy was included provoked considerable discussion, especially in lands where the Inquisition was established. It claimed exclusive jurisdiction on the subject, and finally obtained its acknowledgment in Spain by a brief of Pius V. in 1572.—Joan. de Rojas de Hæreticis, pp. 416, 467 (Valentiæ, 1572). In Italy, however, a distinction was drawn. A decision of the Penitentiary, in 1617, excepted denounced heretics from the benefits of the jubilee, whence it was inferred that those not denounced were entitled to it.—Polacci Comment. in Bull. Urbani VIII. p. 327.

The jubilee bull of Benedict XIII., in 1725, did not contain faculties for absolving in reserved cases and commuting vows, which would seem to deprive his celebration of all advantages, but the omission was argued away because he had recited his intention of following in the footsteps of his predecessors.—Van Ranst, Opusc. de Indulgent. p. 57.

chastity or religion is commutable. No moral considerations are allowed to interfere with the privileges of the jubilee: a vow not to commit fornication or adultery is as readily commutable as any other, and indeed the sinner, if he finds that his fragility endangers the keeping of the vow, is bound to ask for its commutation, for it is his duty to take steps for his own salvation, and the confessor, if he has undertaken to hear the confession, commits a mortal sin in refusing to grant commutation unless he has just cause. Nor is this power limited to the year of the jubilee; the privilege is in its nature perpetual and can be made use of subsequently whenever the sinner desires. The commutation, moreover, though it may be spiritual in its nature, is customarily material aid to the war against the Turk or to the fabric of a church, or some similar object—or, in other words, money.[1] This evidently was a very fruitful region, and the moralists explored all its recesses in a manner more ingenious and profitable than edifying.[2]

The influence of the jubilee on the development and character of indulgences was vastly greater than the recurrence of the solemnity every fifty or twenty-five years would indicate, for, as we have seen, Boniface IX. and his successors spread them out over Europe for a succession of years, and it became the fashion to grant indulgences *in forma jubilæi*;[3] they thus contributed largely to the vulgarizing of plenaries and accustomed the people to expect them. Moreover, when any motive suggested itself, extraordinary jubilees would be published, sometimes limited to Italy and sometimes extended over

[1] Pignatelli, Il Giubileo dell' Anno Santo, pp. 437–8, 441, 450–74.

Pignatelli's book is dedicated to Cardinal Panciatici, the prelate commissioned by Innocent XII. to open the *porta santa*, in the basilica of St. Paul, for the jubilee of 1700, and it may therefore be regarded as a semi-official guide for confessors and penitents on that occasion.

[2] Rodriguez, Bolla della Crociata, pp. 210–17.—Viva de Jubilæo ac Indulg. pp. 259–80.—Bianchi, Foriero dell' Anno Santo, pp. 351–4.—Casus Conscientiæ Bened. PP. XIV. Jan. 1742 cas. ii.

When a "just cause" was required for seeking commutation, the doctors decided that the slightest pretext—even the mere desire of the votary to get rid of his vow—sufficed.—Ludov. Leti Tract. de Indulg. Sect. vii. § 1.

[3] A decree of the Congregation of Indulgences, Sept. 11, 1679, decides that simple indulgences *in forma jubilæi* do not include reserved cases.—Decr. Authentica n. 22.

Europe. These differ somewhat from the regular jubilees of the holy year. As a rule, they last for but fifteen days; certain visits to the churches of the vicinage are prescribed, and fasting on a Wednesday, Friday and Saturday—what van Ranst characterizes as very easy works.[1] The chief distinction, however, consists in the payments required. In the regular jubilee there is nothing prescribed —the pilgrim can make an oblation or withhold it at his pleasure. In the extraordinary jubilee "almsgiving" is one of the enjoined works, and the importance attached to it is seen in the detailed attention given to this feature in the manuals. It is stated to be an imperative condition which cannot be commuted for other good works. Poverty is no excuse; even a beggar must give something if he wishes to gain the indulgence; a strumpet must give it from her filthy gains (*turpe guadagno*), and will do well if she reserves enough to support life and gives all the rest. Heads of families are bound to provide for the necessaries of those under them and to see that their wives, children, and servants are not deprived of this great benefit, but, if a father refuses and his son has absolutely nothing of his own to give, he can steal from his father what is requisite, provided it will not cause scandal in the household. It is the same in monastic houses, where the superiors are obligated to enable the inmates to gain the indulgence, and in case of refusal the latter are justified in taking something belonging to the house, even at the risk of violating their obedience. The "alms" can be given to a beggar, but the "poor" are understood to be churches, hospitals, religious orders and the like, and that this was the customary destination is indicated by the rules laid down that the alms belong to those who own the church and control the other oblations. If it is parochial, they accrue to the parish priest; if it belongs to one of the religious Orders, they go to the house; if it is a cathedral, to the archpriest who has the cure of souls and ministration of the sacraments. The bishop has no right to divert them to the use of the poor or to other establishments, but, as it rests with him to designate the churches to be visited, he can make a bargain beforehand as to a division, but he can only employ the money for pious purposes. In some jubilee bulls the amount of "alms" is left to the discretion of the penitent, but even then it should be proportioned

[1] "Facillima opera"—Van Ranst Opusc. de Indulg. p. 57.

to the means of the individual; in others it is prescribed to be according to his ability, and then, if he does not give a proper amount, he fails to secure the indulgence.[1] There were some strict constructionists who held that the payment must not be for what is a duty otherwise, and therefore the "alms" cannot be given to a person in necessity, which effectually excluded all recipients but the Church.[2] These grasping rules did not suit the piety of Fénelon, who, in publishing the jubilee of 1707, ordered that all who were not absolutely penniless should give at least three sous for the sick poor, and exhorted those who were able to give according to their means. The money was to be paid to the priests, who were to hand it to the treasurers of the local organizations of charity, or, if there were none such, to distribute it prudently among the poor of their parishes.[3] In an extraordinary jubilee, published by Clement XII. in 1735 I find the good Bishop of Padua taking a similar position; all the alms are to pass through the hands of the parish priests to representatives of the poor of their parishes for distribution, and a strict account is to be kept and returned to the episcopal court.[4]

The introduction of the extraordinary jubilee is usually attributed to Sixtus V., who immediately after his accession, in 1585, proclaimed one to obtain the prayers of the faithful that God should direct his actions and confound the enemies of the Church, but he was anticipated by St. Pius V., who, in 1566, published one in order to counteract the spread of heresy, the increasing wickedness of the Catholics and the threatening advance of the Turks.[5] Since Sixtus V. it has been customary for all popes when assuming the functions of their office to do the same. These however are by no means the only occasions for extraordinary jubilees, for, the example having been set, they followed in rapid succession. There was one in 1586, followed by others in 1588, 1589, 1592, 1594, 1599, 1602,

[1] Pignatelli, Il Giubileo dell' Anno Santo, pp. 272–90.—Bianchi, Foriero dell' Anno Santo, pp. 329–30.—Pottoni, Osservazioni sopra i Giubilei, pp. 194–200 (Piacenza, 1587). Theodorus a Spiritu Sancto (De Jubilæo, Cap. VI. § 5, n. 4, 5), while insisting on the necessity of almsgiving denies that it can be provided by theft.

[2] Viva de Jubilæo ac Indulgentiis, pp. 137–43.

[3] Mandement de 1707 (Œuvres de Fénelon, 1838, II. 454).

[4] MS. *penes me.*

[5] Sixti PP. V. Bull. *Virium nostrarum* (Bullar. II. 526).—Amort, I. 103.

1605, 1606, 1608, 1617, 1620 etc.,[1] and the list has gone on increasing to the present day. In modern times they are still profusely used. In preparation for the Vatican council, Pius IX. proclaimed an extraordinary jubilee for 1869, in order to secure the prayers of the faithful for the success of the assembly and to render those prayers more efficacious by being uttered in a state of grace, free from all sin. As the Vatican council was never concluded, but only suspended, in consequence of the Italian occupation of Rome in September, 1870, the jubilee remained in force until it was superseded by that of the holy year 1875.[2] Leo XIII., elected February 20, 1878, allowed a year to elapse before proclaiming the extraordinary jubilee for his accession, which was not issued until February 15, 1879. In March, 1881, he published another, giving as a reason that the times grow worse, churches are despoiled, heretic sects multiply, the property of the Propaganda has been seized, while the nations, diverted from the Church, are plunged into growing miseries; the only resource is in God, to whom the prayers of the faithful are to be directed. In December, 1885, another was proclaimed for the whole year 1886, because the evils of the times are increasing and becoming more persistent through delay.[3] Evidently the faithful are not likely to suffer for lack of opportunity of winning these pardons, and the remark of van Ranst, in 1724, that, between the extraordinary jubilees and those of the holy year, cataracts of indulgences are poured over the people, is as true now as it was then.[4]

---

[1] Amort de Indulgentiis I. 105 sqq. It would be impossible to construct a complete list of all these jubilees. Amort's industry has gathered a large number, but in a collection of papal letters and bulls of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries in my possession are many that have escaped him.

. Fra Paolo tells us that Paul V. issued his jubilee of 1606 as a political weapon in his bitter contest with Venice. The object alleged in the bull was to avert calamities from the Church, but its real intent was to excite disaffection in the Venetian provinces which were under interdict, and therefore could not enjoy its benefits, for there was nothing spiritual so eagerly sought for—"In Italia nessuna cosa spirituale è più desiderata ò aspettata da' popoli, e quando è concessa ricevuta con più divoto affetto."—P. Sarpi, Storia delle cose passate tra Paolo V. e la Repubblica, Lib. III.

[2] Pii PP. IX. Const. *Nemo certe*, 11 Apr. 1868; Litt. Apostol. *Postquam Dei*, 20 Oct. 1870 (Collect. Lacens. VII. 10, 497).—Encycl. *Gravibus* (Acta VI. 350).

[3] Leonis PP. XIII. Litt. Apost. *Pontifices maximi*, 1879; *Militans*, 1881; Encyc. *Quod auctoritate*, 1886 (Acta I. 188; II. 204; V. 169).

[4] Van Ranst Opusc. de Indulg. p. 53.

CHAPTER V.

THE LATER MIDDLE AGES.

THERE were other influences at work in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, besides the jubilee, to relax the conservatism which had previously restricted the inordinate development of indulgences. Chief among these are to be reckoned the religious Orders, and more especially the Mendicants. For their activity in this direction they had especial facilities, not only in the unwavering support and favor of the Holy See, to which they were especially devoted, but in their virtual monopoly of culture and learning, enabling them to advance and substantiate claims which the ignorance of the age was ready to accept.

The indulgences granted to the religious Orders may be considered as of two kinds—those obtainable specially by the members themselves and those which they could bestow on their benefactors and on the faithful who visited their churches. The former were merely a source of benefit to the individuals, the latter served to enrich the houses and the Order at large.

In the earlier period the former were scarcely known. About the middle of the eleventh century it is true that in the ritual for the assumption of the habit there was a prayer that all his sins should be forgiven to the neophyte,[1] but after indulgences were introduced it was argued that entrance into a religious Order was not a fit object for such remissions, which are only given to those needing them, and men entering upon a life of perfection should rather bestow than receive spiritual benefits. There were some doctors who held that monks and friars should not have indulgences, because it would lead to wandering and relaxation of discipline, to which the answer was that they do well to gain them with the permission of the superior, but this could be no excuse for infringement of discipline, for they win more in the reward of eternal life by strict observance than

[1] Sacramentarium Vetus (Migne, CLI. 874).

by obtaining indulgences.[1] How sparingly such favors were granted is seen when Charles le Bel, in 1325, made a special request of John XXII. for the nuns of Poissy, and the pope only conceded a plenary *in mortis articulo*, provided the power of the keys extend so far and it is acceptable to the Divine Majesty.[2] Pontiff and friar bravely overcame this hesitancy. In the early years of the sixteenth century Julius II. and Leo X. showered upon the religious Orders indulgences without stint. All Franciscans and Tertiaries of both sexes were enabled to gain a plenary on any day by reciting the chaplet of the Virgin, consisting of seventy-two Aves and seven Paters, with one more of each for the pope. To the Observantine Franciscans, the Clares and the Tertiaries were conceded the enormous aggregate of the indulgences of all the churches of Rome, Jerusalem and Compostella and the Portiuncula, for the performance of the *Statio Sacratissimi Sacramenti*, consisting of the recitation of five Paters, Aves and Gloria Patris with arms outstretched before the sacrament of the altar. The inclusion of Tertiaries in these grants was a material as well as spiritual benefit, as it attracted the laity to affiliate themselves to an Order thus favored, and even greater pecuniary advantages followed a grant to all regulars of a plenary indulgence for themselves or the liberation of a soul from purgatory for reciting the chaplet of Jesus Christ, consisting of thirty Paters and thirty Aves, or the seven penitential psalms, or the Graduals or the office for the dead. The Franciscans, moreover, were empowered to liberate the souls of their kindred up to and including the third degree by celebrating three masses on any altar.[3]

---

[1] S. Th. Aquin. Summæ Suppl. Q. XXVII. Art. ii. ad 2.—Astesani Summæ Lib. v. Tit. xl. Art. 4, Q. 2; Art. 5, Q. 2.

[2] Ripoll, Bullar. Ord. Prædic. II. 169. The church and abbey of Poissy were commenced by Philippe le Bel and finished by his successors. They occupied the site of a former royal residence, and the grand altar was placed on the spot where Blanche of Castile had given birth to St. Louis. The heart of Philippe le Bel was buried there. Evidently the indulgence was the greatest that royal favor could obtain from an Avignonese pope.

[3] Ferraris Prompta Biblioth. s. v. *Indulgentia*, Art. V. n. 1–11.

These excessive indulgences were reached step by step. In 1456 Glassberger relates (Chron. ann. 1456) that the Franciscan vicar of Austria showed him letters of Calixtus III. granting to the brethren and all the faithful who would recite with arms extended before a cross three short prayers, and then five Paters and Aves kneeling, an indulgence of 20,000 years and some hun-

Before this excessive liberality came in vogue the regulars opened the approaches to it by the eagerness with which they obtained indulgences for those visiting their churches, contributing to the fabric or listening to their preaching, all of which conduced directly to the wealth and influence of the Orders. In the Dominican *Bullarium* there are collected no less than three hundred and eighty-two concessions of these kinds to that Order prior to the end of the pontificate of Leo X., including one granted by John XXIII. and confirmed by Innocent VIII. in 1486, of five years and five quarantines for simply kissing a Dominican habit.[1] The Franciscans were in no way less active, and in one respect they distanced their rivals—in obtaining recognition for the indulgence to the little church known as the Portiuncula, situated about a mile from Assisi, the ruined edifice rebuilt by St. Francis and cherished by him with loving care.[2] As this indulgence is one of the most noted in the Catholic world, and as its evolution offers an instructive insight into the development of our subject, it is worthy of a somewhat detailed examination.

In 1334 Francisco Bartoli, a prominent Franciscan, in his history of the indulgence, gives the legend of its origin to the effect that one

---

dreds. Then, in 1481, Angiolo da Chivasso, the Observantine Vicar-General, obtained from Sixtus IV. the indulgences of the Stations and churches of Rome for all members of the Order, male and female, who would recite with arms extended before the sacrament, five Paters and Aves (Wadding. Annal. Minor. ann. 1481, n. 38). In 1457 Calixtus III. granted plenary remission and absolution once in life and again at death to five of the kindred of every member of the order.—Chron. Glassberger ann. 1457.

[1] Ripoll Bullar. Ord. Prædic. IV. 13. The total number of all kinds of indulgences granted to the Dominicans, as collected by Father Bremond up to 1740, amounts to eight hundred and twenty-five.

[2] Subsequently it was discovered that the Portiuncula was originally known as the church of S. Maria di Josaphat, founded about 355, by four pilgrims from Jerusalem, who brought with them a fragment of the tomb of the Virgin in the valley of Jehosophat and a piece of one of her garments. After its abandonment it was rebuilt by St. Benedict, in 516, when its name was changed to Portiuncula, and subsequently to S. Maria degli Angioli, from the habit angels had of coming there and singing.—Notizie sopra la Sacra Porziuncola, Foligno, 1777, pp. 11–15.—Boveglio, Compendio Storico del Perdona di Assisi, Assisi, 1834, p. 12. These dates however are not wholly agreed upon. Grouwels (Hist. Critica sacræ Indulgentiæ B. Mariæ Angelorum, p. 54) places the founding of the church in 513 and its passing into the hands of Benedict in 540.

night, in 1223, it was revealed to St. Francis that Christ and the Virgin, with a retinue of angels, were awaiting him in the church. On his hastening thither Christ offered to grant him a request for the salvation of men, when he asked that any one who should enter that church should obtain pardon and indulgence for all sins which he had confessed to a priest and for which he had accepted penance. Christ hesitated, but, at the intercession of the Virgin, finally granted the boon and ordered Francis to ask it of his vicar the pope. Apparently the remission was worthless without papal confirmation, and the saint hurried to Honorius III. at Perugia with a request for a free indulgence, without oblations, for all who should visit the church. Honorius at first refused, saying that no one ought to gain an indulgence without payment, and inquiring for how many years he wanted it. Francis replied that he wished all contrite, confessed and absolved, who should visit the church, to be liberated *a culpa et a pœna*, in heaven and on earth, from the time of baptism up to the moment of entrance. To this the pope objected on the ground that it was a form of indulgence unknown to the Roman curia, but, on Francis insisting that it was the command of Christ, he yielded. The cardinals subsequently remonstrated that this would destroy the value of Holy Land indulgences and those for the churches of St. Peter and St. Paul, whereupon Francis was recalled and the indulgence was limited to a single day in the year, on which every one, contrite and confessed, who entered the church should be absolved *a culpa et a pœna*. Francis bent his head in token of assent, and was departing when Honorius asked what evidence he desired of the grant, when he replied none, for the Virgin was his charter, Christ was the notary and the angels were witnesses. On the road back to Assisi he spent a night in the lazar-house at Colle, where he heard a voice that told him that the grant of Honorius was confirmed in heaven. Subsequently Christ and the Virgin again appeared to him and selected the day of the feast of St. Peter *ad vincula*, from first vespers of August 1st to second vespers of August 2, and ordered him to report it to the pope. He did so, bearing with him through the bitter frost of January six miraculous roses as a voucher for the message. Honorius, after some hesitation and consultation with his cardinals, ordered the bishops of Perugia, Assisi, Todi, Spoleto, Foligno, Nocera and Gubbio to assemble on that day at Assisi and publish such an in-

dulgence as Francis might desire. Francis brought them together on the first of August, he preached to the assembled multitude, announced the indulgence and asked the episcopal confirmation. The bishops were scandalized at its magnitude and refused, saying that the pope had no such intention, but when they rose in succession to grant ten years, each in turn was supernaturally compelled to adopt the formula proposed by the saint. The story ends with the names of nineteen persons who were present on this occasion among the crowd collected from the vicinage.[1]

To appreciate fully the audacity of the Franciscans in claiming this indulgence and framing the legend in its support we must bear in mind how wholly foreign to the ideal of Francis would have been the endeavor to bring crowds of pilgrims to the little church which he loved so well. Tommaso da Celano expressly tells us that no layman was allowed to enter it, and this injunction is crystallized in the legend that when Piero da Catania, whom St. Francis had put at the head of the Order, died and was buried in the Portiuncula, and, coruscating in miracles, brought multitudes of worshippers to it, Francis, on returning to Assisi, went to his tomb and addressed him "Brother Peter, in life you were always obedient to me; as, through your miracles, we are pestered by laymen, you must obey me in death. I therefore order you on your obedience to cease from the miracles through which we are troubled by laymen."[2] Moreover, at a time when indulgences were so sparingly granted that none were given on the canonization of Francis, and, on the translation of his remains, only one, two or three years, predicated on the distance travelled by the pilgrim (p. 151), a plenary for the

[1] Grouwels Historia Critica sacræ Indulgentiæ B. Mariæ Angelorum, pp. 187–96 (Antverpiæ, 1726).

There is a vernacular version, of probably somewhat later date, which represents St. Francis as insisting on payment for the indulgence.—Amoni, Legenda S. Francisci, Append. Cap. xxxiii.

The date of the grant is also uncertain. One of the earliest witnesses, Francesco di Fabriano, places it in 1216, at the consecration of the little church by seven bishops. Other accounts specify 1221 and 1224.—Papini, Storia del Perdono d'Assisi, pp. 10, 36 (Firenze, 1824). The best collection of documents that I have met with on the subject is contained in this work. The author had been General of the Conventual Franciscans.

[2] Th. de Celano Vitæ Alteræ P. I. Cap. 2.—Chron. Glassberger (Analecta Franciscana II. 32).

Portiuncula would have attracted universal attention and would have been noted by all disciples who chronicled the achievements of their master. Yet none of them—Tommaso da Celano, the *Legenda Trium Sociorum*, the *Chronica Anonyma*, Thomas of Eccleston, the Chronicle of Jordan, the life by St. Bonaventura—though often alluding to the holiness of the little church and to Francis's love for it, make any mention of his procuring for it an indulgence, miraculously or otherwise. It is the same with the more general historians of the Order, Salimbene and the *Historia Tribulationum*. Alexander Hales, himself a Franciscan, when speaking of plenary indulgences, only knows of crusades as their object, which shows that he had never heard of the Portiuncula.[1] It is true that the later Franciscans claimed verbal confirmations of the grant by Alexander IV., Martin IV., Clement V. and John XXII., and a written one by Benedict XII., but these may unquestionably be assigned to the fiction which was so unscrupulously employed in matters of this kind.[2] Sbaralea, an undoubted authority, states that the first allusion to the Portiuncula in a papal document is in one dated the ninth year of Boniface, which, if Boniface VIII., would be 1303, and if Boniface IX., 1398, while its place of execution shows that it cannot be the former.[3] In fact, when, in 1330, John XXII issued a bull to the Order, reciting and confirming all the indulgences granted to them, he enumerated many from Alexander IV., Innocent IV., Urban IV., Clement IV., Nicholas III., Gregory X., Nicholas IV. and Benedict XI., but made no allusion to the Portiuncula or to its confirmation by any of his predecessors, while those which he mentions are of the moderate character customary at the period—forty days for extending a helping hand and from forty to sixty days for visiting churches, except on certain feasts, when they reach a max-

---

[1] Alex. de Ales Summæ P. IV. Q. XXIII. Membr. 4, 8. Salimbene, whose chronicle runs from the foundation of the Order to 1287, does not even mention the Portiuncula church.

[2] Wadding. Annal. ann. 1223 n. 3, 4.—Chron. Glassberger ann. 1282. Wadding even gives the title of the bull of Benedict XII. as *Fundata in montibus*, but he does not print it either in his text or register of papal documents.

[3] Sbaraleæ Bullar. Francisc. IV. 568.—Ripoll Bullar. Ord. Prædic. II. 67. The bull merely grants to the Dominican church of S. Maria at Viterbo, for the feast of the Annunciation, the same indulgence as is given at the Portiuncula on Aug. 1 and 2. We shall see that Boniface IX. made many such grants.

imum of ten years and six quarantines.[1] Evidently the Portiuncula, although in existence, had no such prominence as to entitle it to specific mention.

The truth doubtless is that some indulgence suited to the period was obtained for the Portiuncula church, very likely by Elias, the worldly successor of St. Francis, and was quietly exaggerated and claimed to be of peculiar efficacy. Nothing is heard of it for fifty years, until, in 1267, the Blessed Francesco di Fabriano relates that he went to Assisi to gain it. Already, however, it was asserted to have been granted to St. Francis, for he states that Brother Leo, one of the earliest associates of the saint, told him so.[2] It had to struggle with an incredulous world for, ten years later, a strenuous effort was made to obtain testimony of its genuineness. Fra Benedetto d'Arezzo, who had been admitted to the Order by Francis himself, testified that he had heard Fra Masseo da Marignano, who had accompanied St. Francis in his interview with Honorius, state that the pope granted it willingly. A certain Pietro Zalfani deposed that he was present when St. Francis announced the indulgence to the people. Brother Leo was dead by this time, but Giovanni Capoli testified to asking him whether the indulgence was genuine, and had from him an account of the grant, showing that Honorius objected and offered one, three or seven years before yielding, and further that Leo attempted to explain the long dormant condition of the indulgence by asserting that Francis had forbidden him to speak of it until near his death, for it was not to be operative as yet; it would be hidden for a time, but God would reveal it hereafter: he also told of the voice at Colle which assured Francis of its confirmation in heaven.[3] The whole inquest is utterly worthless as evidence except as to what was wanted at the moment—to connect in some way the indulgence with St. Francis and to justify a plenary for which no grant could be exhibited. There was as yet no thought of at-

[1] Chron. Glassberger ann. 1330. [2] Papini, p. 36.

[3] Prospero Lambertini, Discorso pp. 11–12 (Foligno, 1721).—Tofi da Bettona, Trattato dell' Indulgenza detto il Perdono d'Agosto, p. 68 (Urbino, 1644).—Papini, pp. 34–38.—Baluz. et Mansi Miscell. II. 123.—Baluze prints two recensions of this inquest. The testimony of Capoli is only in the second and longer one. The injunction on Leo to keep silence is "Teneas secretum hoc usque circa mortem tuam, quia non habet locum adhuc; quia hæc indulgentia occultabitur ad tempus sed Dominus trahet eam extra et manifestabitur."

tributing it to Christ; it was represented as simply an exercise of the papal power, and the supernatural element is absent, except in the voice which announced the ratification in heaven of the concession made by Honorius. It is the same with a subsequent effort to overcome the persistent doubts which continued to assert themselves. About 1310 Teobaldo, Bishop of Assisi, issued a manifesto asserting its authenticity, based upon the inquest of 1277, without embroidering the story with miraculous details, beyond adding the assertion that it was revealed to St. Francis at night that he should go to Perugia and obtain an indulgence from Honorius—a step in advance which illustrates the process of evolution of the legend.[1]

There evidently as yet was no necessity felt for claiming other than a papal origin for the indulgence. It was growing fast in popular estimation with the extension of the cult of St. Francis and of the influence of his Order. At first there seems to have been no repugnance as to receiving oblations, and the pardon brought in revenues disturbing to the scruples of the stricter members, for, in 1280 or 1282, the General Bonagrazia, who belonged to the rigid party, and, in 1279, had taken part in framing the bull *Exiit qui seminat*, forbidding the handling of money by Franciscans, prohibited the acceptance of offerings at the Portiuncula to avoid all appearance of cupidity, and by the time of the manifesto of Teobaldo the story of the grant was interpolated with the passage describing St. Francis's insistance on this point and the surprise of Honorius at such a condition.[2] The members of the Order, moreover, were apparently eager to win the pardon, for there is a statute of the General Chapter of 1295 ordering the ministers to be more sparing in granting licence to the brethren to go to Assisi for the indulgence and not to give it to those who had already enjoyed it, because their multitude was oppressive to the convent there and to the houses on the road.[3] That the Portiuncula, in fact, was beginning to attract

[1] Papini, p. 39.

[2] Chron. Glassberger ann. 1282.—Papini, pp. 15, 39. Yet this disinterestedness was not of long duration. Soon afterwards we have a letter of Sancha, Queen of Naples, sending to the Portiuncula indulgence sixty florins for herself and sixty for her husband, Robert the Pious.—Papini, p. 51.

[3] Wadding. Annal. ann. 1295, n. 12.—In 1446 a somewhat similar rule was adopted by the chapter restricting the number of pilgrims to six from each province, and no one was to have permission oftener than once in six years.—Amort, II. 229–30.

multitudes is indicated in the remark of Angelo da Clareno, who speaks of the crowds assembling at Narbonne to do honor to Jean Pierre Olivi on his feast-day as not less than those which are said to gather at the feast of S. Maria de Portiuncula.[1]

Thus far it had developed, without claiming a miraculous origin, in spite of opposition, which was at times vigorous. We hear of a Dominican bishop who threatened with excommunication all of his subjects who should visit the pardon of Assisi.[2] More serious than this, however, was the misfortune which overtook it when, in 1323, Assisi was captured by the Perugians after a long siege and was laid under an interdict, because during the war the besieged had seized and expended the treasure of the Franciscans. This suspended all solemnities on the Portiuncula anniversary and reduced the indulgence to a shadow, nor was it of short duration, for, in 1361, we find Cardinal Albornoz suspending the interdict from July 28th to August 3d for the benefit of the Portiuncula, and it was not finally removed until 1367.[3] Doubtless it was to neutralize the evil effect of the interdict that the marvels of the legend were invented and published, to attribute to it a divine origin, and thus render it superior to all human ordinances. In 1333 the legend seems to have been unknown to Gerard Odo, the Franciscan General, for in that year he wrote a long epistle to the brethren of Assisi on the celebration of the indulgence, in which there is no allusion to its having been granted by Christ, although he instructs them to have its history read at table on that day.[4] In 1334, as we have seen, Francesco Bartoli promulgated the legend, and, in 1335, Corrado, Bishop of Assisi, gave it his episcopal sanction, and republished the inquest of 1277 as evidence of its authenticity.[5]

Thus vouched for it was, of course, accepted by the Franciscans, but their rivals still continued to discredit the indulgence. The doubts which still hung over it and the jealousy which it excited are manifested by the miracles which were still required to prove its authenticity. Thus we are told that a company of pilgrims from Slavonia, bound for Assisi and landing at Ancona, were met by a priest, who told them that the Portiuncula was doubtful and had no

[1] Franz Ehrle, Archiv für Litteratur und Kirchengeschichte, I. 544.
[2] Papini, p. 14.
[3] Ibid. pp. 24–5, 63.
[4] Ibid. p. 59—"Ad mensam vero legi facite Ystoriam impetratæ licentiæ."
[5] Baluz. et Mansi, *loc. cit.*

papal bull to verify it, while he could promise them authentic indulgences as good, for which he exhibited the documents. All were persuaded save one pious woman, who started alone for Assisi. When about two miles on her journey she met a venerable man in a Dominican habit, who assured her that the Portiuncula was genuine and that her companions would follow; she looked back and saw them just appearing over a hill to join her. She died at Assisi, and her companions on their return, while at sea, were visited with a terrible tempest, but when all hope was gone she appeared to them and the storm subsided.[1] Yet the doubters were not silenced. When St. Birgitta was at Assisi, Christ in a vision asked her why she was so much troubled; she replied that it was because of those who said that the indulgence had been fabricated by St. Francis and was null, when Christ comforted her with the assurance that he had granted it and that no pope would ever recall it.[2] This was evidently suggested by the fact that when Urban V. was in Rome, in 1367, he said that the indulgences of the Portiuncula, of St. Mary of Aquila, and St. Mary of Orvieto were invalid and that he proposed to annul them.[3] He did not carry out his threat, at least with regard to the Portiuncula, but he did impose on it some restrictions or limitations, the precise nature of which is not known, but that they were serious is apparent from the earnest appeals of the friars for their removal.[4] In 1388 Cardinal Bonifazio de' Amanati, in his commentary on the Clementines, treats as a fraud the claim that the Portiuncula is applicable to the dead and speaks of it generally in a tone of contempt.[5] Yet the Franciscans held firm and eventually triumphed;

---

[1] Bart. Pisan. Lib. conformitatum Lib. II. P. ii. Fruct. 2.

[2] S. Birgittæ Revelation. Extrav. Cap. 90.

When St. Birgitta founded her Order of S. Salvator, with a mother-house at Wadstena, Linkoping, Sweden, she emulated St. Francis and had a vision in which Christ addressed Urban V., ordering him to confirm to it the indulgence which he had granted, viz., the same as that of St. Peter *ad vincula* in Rome. Then turning to St. Birgitta he told her that if she could not obtain the letters without payment she should do without them, as he would confirm his word, the saints would be his witnesses and the Virgin his seal.—Revelat. Lib. IV. Cap. 137.

[3] Palmieri, Tract. de Pœnit. p. 457. This is stated by Piero, Bishop of Orvieto, papal vicar of Urban V., in his MS. Scholia on the *Liber Pontificalis*.

[4] Papini, pp. 64–66.

[5] J. B. Thiers, Traité des Superstitions, T. IV. p. 259.

the period was one when indulgences were rapidly expanding, the most extravagant claims were unblushingly made and accepted, and nothing was too gross for popular credulity. The *Liber Conformitatum* of Bartolommeo da Pisa, written in 1390, collected and embalmed all the legends which had grown up around St. Francis and was universally received as authentic. He included, of course, the story of the Portiuncula with a few embellishments; it became accepted by the Church, and has since then been regarded as indubitable. Benedict XIV., who, as Prospero Lambertini, had occasion, in 1720, to investigate thoroughly the Portiuncula, only ventures to say that, as it has been repeatedly recognized by the popes, there would be great temerity in calling it in question merely because it is supported by no authentic evidence,[1] and the importance attached to it is indicated by the fact that Paul IV. was in the habit of saying that it alone sufficed to prove, not only the power of the Church to grant indulgences, but also the authority of the Roman pontiff.[2]

With the growing diffusion of indulgences the Portiuncula was not allowed the monopoly of this one. Boniface IX. was chronically in want of money and always ready to transmute into coin the power of the keys. Hardly had the authenticity of the Portiuncula been recognized when other churches sought to share its privileges. We have just seen that, in 1398, he granted it to the Dominicans of Viterbo, and in the same year he extended it to S. Maria Maggiore, in Rome, for the feast of St. Jerome, September 30th, soon after which it is recorded as bestowed on other churches in Germany, Italy, the Netherlands and England, and these are presumably only a portion of those which obtained it.[3] It was further turned to account by getting the popes to grant it on the occasions of the triennial general chapters of the Franciscans, when it was offered to all who would visit the church where they assembled and give them "alms." In 1457, when the chapter was held at Milan, we are told that at least a hundred thousand pilgrims came to the city to gain it, that fifteen men and women were crushed to death, and that the collections amounted to more than 10,000 gold pieces.[4] The Do-

[1] Bened. PP. XIV. De Synodo Diœces. Lib. XIII. Cap. xvii. § 5.
[2] M. Medinæ de Indulg. Cap. 13 (Venetiis, 1564).
[3] Amort de Indulg. I 200, 222.—Grouwels, pp. 112 sqq.
[4] Wadding. Annal. ann. 1437, n. 32; ann. 1440, n. 16; ann. 1457, n. 54.

minicans were not much behind it in the race, for about this time St. Antonino tells us that their churches of S. Maria de Angelis at Ferrara and St. Mary Magdalen at Bagnols enjoyed similar plenaries.[1] Indulgences were now rapidly becoming vulgarized, and those who had contributed so powerfully to this tendency by obtaining or assuming grants which at the time seemed exorbitant, were finding themselves cast into the background by even larger and more liberal concessions to their rivals. The Portiuncula itself becomes trivial in comparison with a plenary bestowed by Leo X., in 1513, on the church of St. Ann, belonging to the Minims of Padua; by this all visiting and assisting the church gained it, without limitation of days or prescription of other works.[2]

The Portiuncula, moreover, was gradually extended to the churches of the affiliated Orders. In 1622 Gregory XV. granted it to all those of the Observantines and Recollects, and in 1741 the Congregation of Indulgences decided that it was enjoyed by those of the Clares.[3] In 1643 Urban VIII. conferred the same privilege on those of the Tertiary Order of St. Francis, but, in 1819, a decree of the Congregation limited this to the Tertiaries themselves and withdrew it from the faithful at large.[4] During the Napoleonic regime churches in Italy were taken from the Franciscans and bestowed on secular priests, who kept them after the Restoration and insisted that the indulgence still attached to them. To put a stop to this the Congregation, in 1818, decided that all churches passing out of Franciscan hands lost the indulgence, but the secular priests paid no attention to the decree and adduced an alleged declaration of Pius VII. At length, in 1841, the Franciscans appealed to the Congregation, which decided that Pius had made no such declaration, but, with the ever-sensitive dread of scandal, it added that, where the claim had been made the priest could apply to the pope for a concession.[5]

---

[1] S. Antonini Summæ P. I. Tit. x. Cap. 3, § 4.

[2] Hergenröther, Regest. Leon. PP. X. n. 2312.

[3] Gregor. PP. XV. Const. *Splendor æternæ*.—Decr. Authent. n. 102–3; Append. n. 3.—See also Grouwels, pp. 140 sqq.

[4] Urbani PP. VIII. Const. *Cum sicut* (Bullar. IV. 381).—Decr. Authent. n. 421.

[5] Decr. Authent. n. 409, 533. The Congregation had been more rigid, in 1749, when it decided that the parish churches in Goa, though served by Franciscans, were not entitled to the indulgence.—Ibid. n. 176.

Yet the Portiuncula maintained its attractions in spite of this and of the constant multiplication of indulgences, such as the plenary granted, in 1707, by Clement XI. to the Tertiary churches for the feasts of St. Louis (August 15) and of St. Elizabeth of Hungary (November 19)—extended, in 1755, by Benedict XIV. to all the Observantine churches—to say nothing of a similar one by Clement XI., in 1712, to all Dominican churches on the feast of St. Pius V. (May 5).[1] The crowds which flocked to gain it on August 2 suffered no diminution, and what these crowds were may be estimated from the assertion of Father Chassaing, in 1655, that the brethren of St. Maria degl' Angioli did not consider the celebration successful unless there were at least nearly a hundred thousand communicants.[2] Not satisfied with this, the craving for constantly greater privileges led them to claim that the indulgence had been enlarged, so that it could be gained on every day of the year. They assumed that this had been instituted secretly by St. Francis, to be handed down by tradition among his disciples, and this secret tradition was spread abroad so successfully that multitudes visited the church on all the solemnities of the year, in the confident expectation of gaining it. Emboldened by success they encouraged the belief by affirming it in an inscription over the entrance—"Augusti hic veniam dat tibi quæque dies." Finally they claimed that this daily extension had been confirmed by Pius III., in 1544, when on a visit to the convent of S. Francesco del Monte at Perugia, but the only evidence produced of so important a concession was a deposition made, in 1588, by Matteo Bardo, Bishop of Chiusi, that he had been present forty-four years before, when the popular belief was mentioned to the pope, and he said he shared it, and that, even if it were not so, he granted it.[3] At length the claim attracted the attention of the Holy See; in 1691 it was fully debated before the Congregation of the Inquisition, which disallowed it and made the friars remove the inscription, while the books which had

[1] Clement. PP. XI. Const. *Injunctæ; Redemptoris* (Bullar. VIII. 51, 111).—Decr. Authent. Append. n. 16.

[2] Grouwels, p. 178.

[3] Stefano Tofi da Bettona, Trattato dell' Indulgenza Plenaria detta il Perdona d'Agosto, 1644, pp. 46, 61, 71–2, 74–80, 83–5 —Michel 'Angelo di Bogliasco, Indulgenza Plenaria detta Portiuncula, 1662, pp. 39, 41.—Wadding. Annal. ann. 1223, n. 4, 5.—Lorte y Escartin, Epitome Historial y Moral de la Indulgencia Plenaria etc., Zaragoza, 1678, pp. 117–21.

been written in its defence were placed on the Index. That of Bogliasco had already been so treated in 1680, and that of Tofi followed in 1698.[1]

It was possibly to make amends in some measure for this rebuff, and perhaps also to appease the intense jealousy between the rival Observantine and Conventual branches of the Franciscans that, in 1695, Innocent XII. granted a daily plenary to all, contrite, confessed and communed, visiting either the church of S. Maria degl' Angioli or that of St. Francis in Assisi and praying for intention.[2] In the division of the Order the Observantines had obtained the Portiuncula church and the Conventuals the splendid one of St. Francis in Assisi. Around the original humble edifice the Observantines had constructed a magnificent building, capable of accommodating several thousand worshippers and known as S. Maria degl' Angioli ;[3] the new indulgence was obtainable by visiting the latter, while the Portiuncula required the devotee to pass through the little church, or chapel, as it was called, which still stood inside, and this only on the solemnity of August 2. Extensive as was the grant of Innocent XII. it was little prized by the Observantines, possibly because it was shared by their hated rivals ; they continued to vaunt the superiority of the Portiuncula over all other indulgences, and the crowds flocking to the anniversary showed no sign of diminution. This popular eagerness was partly traditional and partly justified. Even the Dominican Bianchi explains that, according to the belief accepted by the Church, the Portiuncula was granted directly by Christ, while the others were conceded by his vicar, and people prefer to drink at the fountain head, and Möhr argues that it therefore is much more certain, for Christ cannot err and the popes can.[4] The Observantines, indeed, assumed that the Portiuncula was wholly independent of the pope, that he could not suspend it during the

[1] Prospero Lambertini, Discorso, Foligno, 1721, pp. 19–20.—Index Innoc. XI. p. 140; Append. p. 28.

[2] Innoc. PP. XII. Constt. *Redemptoris ; Commissæ* (Bullar. VII. 244).

[3] The great exterior church was rebuilt in 1569, by order of St. Pius V., on a still grander scale, and is said to be the largest in Europe, save St. Peter's in Rome and St. Paul's in London. Nearly ruined by earthquakes in 1832, it was speedily restored by the contributions of the faithful.—Boveglio, Compendio Storico, pp. 62, 78, 88.

[4] Bianchi, Foriero dell' Anno Santo, p. 272.—Möhr, Portiuncula Theologica, pp. 60–1, 71 (Salisburgi, 1670).

jubilee, and never had done so, though we have seen this not to be the case, and, in 1526, Clement VII. distinctly asserted that it had been conceded by the Holy See on account of the merits and miracles of St. Francis.[1] Still its unrivalled efficacy was a tradition handed down at least from the time of Bartolommeo da Pisa, who informs us that a demon was forced to declare that, if a man had slain with his own hand the whole human race, and came, contrite and confessed, to Assisi on August 2, as soon as he entered the church his soul would be cleansed from sin, like that of an infant from the baptismal font.[2]

Unquestionably the Portiuncula possesses material advantages. That upon which its advocates seem to lay the most stress is the ease of its acquirement. St. Francis, they tell us, especially provided that no fasting, discipline, prayers or other penal exercises should be necessary; to any one, repentant and confessed, the only obligation is to pass through the little church, and if, by reason of a crowd or other impediment, the devotee cannot enter, a visit made to the door or to the cemetery suffices. Even contrition and confession are not requisite if there is no consciousness of mortal sin, nor is actual intention. Virtual suffices; if the visit is prompted solely by other motives, the indulgence is not gained, but if the intention is equally divided between this and curiosity or business, or to meet a lover, or other secular object, the indulgence is won.[3]

Formerly the Portiuncula had a pre-eminence in its applicability to souls in Purgatory, for, long before this was thought of for other indulgences, as we shall see hereafter, Bartolommeo da Pisa claimed it for the Portiuncula, and proved it by abundant miracles. One of these illustrates so forcibly the merchantable character of these privileges that it is worth relating. About 1308, as we are told, a knight of Apulia named Francesco, in company with some pilgrims and a peasant in his pay, came to Assisi. On their return the peasant became footsore and unable to travel, whereupon he reproached the knight for bringing him, as he would be left alone without money to take him home. The knight, whose brother had recently

[1] Clement. PP. VII. Const. *Accepimus*.—Prosp. Lambertini, Discorso, p. 93.

[2] Lib. Conformitat. fol. 138, col. 1 (Ed. 1513).

[3] Möhr, *op. cit.* pp. 78–9.—Tofi da Bettano, *op. cit.* pp. 13, 35, 166–7.—Bogliasco, *op. cit.* pp. 105–6, 112.—Instruzione per un' Anima fedele, p. 170 (Finale, 1787).—Boveglio, Compendio Storico, p. 37.

died, offered to reimburse all expenses and carry him home on horseback if he would make over the indulgence which he had gained to the brother's soul in purgatory, to which the other agreed, and in presence of all the company duly assigned the indulgence. Next day, on the road, the soul of the brother appeared in surpassing splendor, declared that the indulgence had transferred him to heaven, and as a voucher for his truth related to the knight what had happened at home during his absence.[1] Even after indulgences for the dead became common the Portiuncula was asserted to be better than the papal ones, for these can act only by way of suffrage, while it, being granted by Christ, acts directly as an absolution.[2] Curiously enough, there was no warrant for all this save the miracles which continued to be profusely related.[3] It was not until 1687 that Innocent XI. granted application to the souls in purgatory for the Portiuncula in the Observantine churches, and, in 1689, extended this to those of the Capuchins.[4] Even more distinctive than this, moreover, is the exclusive privilege that the Portiuncula can be transferred to the living as well as to the dead—the pilgrim who gains it can apply it at his pleasure to any one, on earth or in purgatory. In addition to all this it can be vicariously gained by any one who chooses to send a representative. Bogliasco informs us that this was largely practised by the nobles of Venetia, Slavonia and other regions, and that the sacristan every year was called upon for eight or ten thousand certificates for the benefit of those who thus won the indulgence by deputy.[5] To crown all, the Portiuncula indulgence can be gained *toties quoties*—every time a man walks through the little church, on August 2, he wins it, so that after obtaining it for himself he can duplicate it indefinitely for the benefit of friends on earth or souls in purgatory, by merely applying it mentally to those whom he selects. It is true that the Congregation of the Council denied this privilege in 1700 and again in 1703, but in 1847 the Congregation of Indulgences affirmed it, and this was approved by Pius IX.[6]

---

[1] Lib. Conformitat. fol. 136, col. 2; fol. 139.

[2] Tofi, *op. cit.* pp. 178–9.—Bogliasco, *op. cit.* pp. 114–17.

[3] Möhr, p. 43.—Tofi, p. 23.

[4] Innoc. PP. XI. Const. *Alias* (Bullar. XI. 510, 602).

[5] Bogliasco, pp. 55–6.—Tofi, p. 23.—Lambertini, Discorso, p. 25.

[6] Tofi, pp. 174–77.—Lambertini, pp. 27–8.—Ferraris, Prompta Bibliotheca, s. v. *Indulgentia*, Art. v. n. 57.—Decr. Authent. n. 620.—Raccolta di Indul-

The Portiuncula is thus supremely attractive, and notwithstanding its extension to other Franciscan churches, the primitive custom of seeking it at the fountain head continued. The solemnities of the anniversary consisted in a procession of the Observantines from their convent hard-by S. Maria degl' Angioli to the church of St. Francis in the town, where they were joined by the Conventuals, and the united bodies marched back to S. Maria, reaching there at first vespers, when the doors were opened and they entered, followed by the crowd of devotees eager to win the pardon by passing through the little interior church, which is only about seventeen feet by thirty-seven, with a door of entrance nine feet wide and one of exit of eight feet.[1] The crowd was frequently unmanageable, leading to disorders; the rivalry between the Observantines and Conventuals could sometimes not be repressed, and, in 1720, the former applied to the Holy See to discontinue the procession or so to modify it as to prevent scandals. The matter was referred to the Congregation of the Council of Trent, where the supplication of the Observantines was answered by Prospero Lambertini, afterwards Benedict XIV. and then secretary of the Congregation, who espoused the cause of the Conventuals at the request of their protector, Cardinal Vallemani. The statement and plea of the Observantines afford an interesting inside view of these celebrations.[2]

It would seem that, in 1517, the mutual hatred of the two branches of the Order was especially bitter, probably in consequence of the reorganization by Leo X., which gave to the Observantines the General Minister and precedence in all processions. When, therefore, in that year, their procession reached the church of St. Francis, the Conventuals politely invited them into the refectory for a collation, closed the doors on them, and, with the assistance of laymen, set upon them, sword in hand. Fortunately a cooler-headed Conven-

---

genze, Camerino, 1803, p. 39.—Raccolta, Ed. 1886, p. 477.—Gröne, der Ablass, p. 144.

[1] The disproportionate size of these doors is owing to the forethought of St. Benedict, when he rebuilt the church in 516 and providently made ready for the rush of pilgrims who were to be attracted by the pardon eight hundred years later.—Boveglio, Compendio Storico, p. 13.

[2] Scripturæ Facti et Juris in quibus exponuntur . . . scandala ac inconvenientiæ quæ annuatim die primi Augusti . . . exoriuntur, Romæ, 1720.—My copy of this rare tract formerly belonged to the Portiuncula library.

tual opened a back door, through which they fled, pursued by their enemies. Several were slain and a number wounded, which led to the abandonment of the joint procession until, in 1526, it was resumed by order of Clement VII. Good feeling, however, was not restored, and there was a standing complaint that the Conventuals persisted in carrying at their head a strip of parchment on which St. Francis had written the benediction, Numbers, VI. 24–26, for the benefit of brother Leo, whom it relieved of a temptation. This relic they led the people to believe was the indulgence itself, which they thus carried into the church. In 1719 a zealous Observantine snatched at it—as he declared, to kiss it reverently, but, as the others asserted, to take it away—when he was set upon and beaten and trampled almost to death.

The main trouble, however, was with the crowd gathered before the door of S. Maria, ranging from sixty to a hundred thousand in number, sweating under an August sun, impatiently screaming and howling while awaiting the procession, and, when the door was opened, making a mad rush, throwing the procession into confusion and endangering the lives of the cross-bearers. Inside of the church the surge was dreadful, especially in the endeavor to squeeze through the little chapel with its narrow doors, and catastrophes were not infrequent. No record was kept of the injured, except that in 1701 there were fifty, but they must have been greatly more numerous than the deaths. Of these there were fifteen in 1660, one each in 1665, 1679, 1680, and 1681, eight in 1684, one each in 1694 and 1696, fourteen in 1699, twelve in 1701, three in 1718, and some in 1719. Various efforts were made to abate the disorder. A guard of soldiers armed with staves was stationed before the doors, but this only made the matter worse, for the devotees provided themselves with staves and pretended to be soldiers, thus procuring entrance, when they threw their staves on the floor, tripping up those who followed, and no man, when once down, could rise again. In 1710 Bishop Vidman, then governor of Perugia, wrote to Cardinal Paolucci congratulating himself on the exceeding good luck with which the occasion had passed. This he attributed to his precautions in warning the friars to be peaceful with each other and in providing the soldiers with weapons in place of staves. Fire-arms having been prohibited, he had utilized 140 halberds and 100 half-pikes which he had found in the fortress, and he asked that a larger

supply be laid in and kept for this special purpose. He had also forbidden all games and stages of charlatans near the church, which had led to much thievery and many scandals. The loss of life in 1701 was occasioned by a profane abuse through which nobles and ladies were admitted into the church in advance and were served with refreshments to beguile the time of waiting. On this occasion a quarrel occurred between two gentlemen, leading to effusion of blood. This necessitated the benediction of the church, during the progress of which the procession arrived and was obliged to wait. The crowd grew more impatient than usual, and when the doors were thrown open the crush was frightful, leading to a number of deaths and to the prohibition, in 1705, of serving refreshments in the church. Yet, in spite of the facts presented by the Observantines and admitted by Lambertini, his learning and influence prevailed, and the decision of the Congregation was *servetur solitum*—the wonted customs were to be preserved.

In 1743 there was another scandal. Owing to pestilence it was thought advisable to prevent the assembling of the usual crowds, and, late in July, a command was issued suspending the indulgence. There was some discrepancy between the orders from Rome and those from the governor of Perugia; the Observantines choose to assume that only the procession was forbidden and not the indulgence, for this gave them an opportunity of disabusing the people of the belief inculcated by the Conventuals that the indulgence was carried into the church by the latter. The Observantines consequently disobeyed the mandate to close their doors on August 1st and 2d; the police had to be invoked, who nailed them up and mounted guard over them till the time had passed, and pickets were thrown out on all the roads to turn pilgrims back. The affair led to an exchange of pamphlets between the rival sections of the Order in which their mutual hatred was vigorously expressed.[1] Apparently it was impossible to prevent disorder arising from the procession, and, in 1820, the magistrates of Assisi felt compelled to ask that it be discontinued, a request that was granted.[2] It was soon

[1] Difesa di quanto hanno operato i Religiosi di S. Maria degl' Angioli nell' anno 1743 s. l., 1743.

[2] Papini, p. 28.—There were no bounds to the adoration inculcated for St. Francis by his zealous and indiscreet disciples. He is to be worshipped with the adoration of *latria*—the supreme worship which the theologians say

afterwards renewed, and with it the pretension of the Conventuals that they carry the indulgence to the church—an error, the prevalence of which Boveglio, in 1834, feels obliged elaborately to disprove.[1]

Great as was the audacity of the Franciscans, it was largely outstripped by that of the Carmelites. The success of the latter has had so commanding an influence in multiplying indulgences and in enlarging their sphere of action, as we shall have occasion to see hereafter, that a cursory examination into their history and development becomes necessary for a clear understanding of the subject. In the third century persecution and the thirst for asceticism filled the solitudes of Egypt with anchorites, dwelling in hermitages or monasteries. Hilarion, the disciple of St. Antony, carried the custom into Palestine, where, as St. Jerome informs us, there had previously been nothing of the kind.[2] The Holy Land speedily abounded in recluses of both sexes, who found in the mountains and deserts ample opportunity for gratifying their ardor of maceration and contemplation. As monachism grew to be an important element of the Christian organization there was a natural desire to find its prototype in the Old Covenant, and Jerome proudly asserted that its originators were Elijah and Elisha and the sons of the prophets, who retired from the wrath of the idolaters to the fastnesses of

(Macri, Hierolexicon s. v. *Dulia*) is due to God alone. When he died his soul passed through purgatory like an arrow, drawing with it all the souls there, accompanied by whom it entered the court of heaven. Every year on his feast-day he descends to purgatory and carries back to heaven all of his three Orders there, or, as some say, all of his devotees. For four hundred and twenty years his body has been standing in his tomb without support, its eyes turned to heaven as if alive, the flesh white and soft, and the stigmata dropping blood (Bogliasco, pp. 141–44). The accuracy of this last statement is conjectural, for, in 1476, Sixtus IV. ordered the stair-case walled up which leads to the crypt in which St. Francis lies, and since then, as Lambertini informs us, the corpse has been seen by no one.

[1] Boveglio, Compendio Storico, p. 39.

[2] Hieron. Vit. S. Hilarionis Eremitæ n. 14—"Necdum enim tunc monasteria erant in Palestina, nec quisquam monachum ante sanctum Hilarionem in Syria noverat. Ille fundator et eruditor hujus conversationis et studii in hac provincia fuit. Habebat Dominus Jesus in Ægypto senem Antonium; habebat in Palæstina Hilarionem juniorem."

St. Jerome evidently made no distinction between the eremitic and cœnobitic life. All who lived in hermitages or monasteries were monks.

Mount Carmel, but he was careful to avoid making any claim to an uninterrupted descent.[1] What was the condition of the monks of Palestine during the Saracenic domination we have scanty means of knowing, but we may reasonably doubt the Carmelite assertion that when, in 639, Omar conquered the land he destroyed no less than seven thousand of their convents.[2] After the founding of the Latin kingdom of Jerusalem by the first crusade it was natural that pilgrims ascetically disposed should seek salvation by adopting the eremitic life in the spots made holy by tradition. Jacques de Vitry, about 1220, tells us that some settled themselves in the desert where Christ retired after baptism, and there served him in little cells; others imitated Elijah and dwelt on Mount Carmel, near Cayphas, by the fountain known as the fountain of Elijah, not far from the monastery of St. Margaret.[3] He makes no allusion to their being organized as an Order, nor, of course, could they have any connection with such monks as might have survived the Saracenic domination, who necessarily belonged to the Greek Church, and as such were abhorrent to the Latins. Still there may be some foundation for the Rule which the Carmelites claimed to have been given to them by Albert, Patriarch of Jerusalem, January 13, 1171, for, besides the very rigid prescription of fasting and prayer, it requires the hermits, dwelling apart in cells, to maintain themselves by labor, quoting the example and words of St. Paul (II. Thess. III. 8–10), "if any man will not work, neither let him eat"—a command

---

[1] Hieron. Epist. LVIII. ad Paulinum Cap. 5; Epist. CXXV. ad Rusticum Cap. 7.—Cf. S. Isidori de Eccles. Officiis Lib. II. Cap. 16.—IV. Kings IV. 38; VI. 1–3; Jeremiah XXXV. 6–9.

Towards the close of the twelfth century Joachim of Flora (Concordiæ Lib. II. Cap. xiv.) says that monachism is derived partly from Elisha and partly from Benedict. See also his *Expositio super Apocalypsim*, P. I. T. 30.

[2] Papebrochii Propylæi Antiquar. P. II. n. 28.

[3] Jac. de Vitriaco Hist. Hierosol. Lib. I. Cap. 52.—There is a claim that the Order was organized, in 1141, by Aimeric, Patriarch of Antioch, who appointed his kinsman Berthold as prior.—Werneri Rolevinck Fascic. Temporum ann. 1184.

When it was struggling for recognition its opponents asserted that the hermits of Mount Carmel were not known by the title of the Virgin Mary, but by that of St. Mary of Egypt, who had retired there to bewail her sins.—Camillo d'Ausilio, Sommario dell' Origine della Religione Carmelitana, p. 33 (Brescia, 1603).

which they subsequently claimed to have been modified by Innocent IV., in 1248, in a provision enabling them to substitute beggary for labor.[1]

The time when the Carmelite Order first made its appearance in Europe has been the subject of prolonged and acrimonious controversy. The two new mendicant Orders of St. Francis and St. Dominic had just been superadded to the numerous fractions which had separated themselves from the old Benedictines. Both new and old felt a not unnatural jealousy of any further rivals in the monastic field, and this feeling had already been strong enough to elicit from the Lateran council of 1216 a canon forbidding the formation of any more; all who desired to enter a religious life were commanded to

[1] Ps. Honor. PP. III. Bull. *Ut vivendi*, 1226; Ps. Innocent. PP. IV. Bull. *Quæ honorem*, 1248 (Bullar. I. 70, 89).

These are bulls confirming the rule. They are manifestly fictitious. That of Honorius must have been manufactured subsequently to 1476, as it is absent from the "Mare Magnum" granted to the Order in that year by Sixtus IV. To make up for this the Carmelites had a legend that Honorius was obliged to issue the bull by the Virgin in person, and by the death of two of his officials who had opposed it (Privilegia Fratrum Discalciat. B. V. Maria de Monte Carmeli, Madriti, 1700, pp. 2–6), and this is authenticated by its insertion in the office of the feast of the Virgin of M. Carmel, July 16 (Guglielmi, Recueil des Indulgences Authentiques, Paris, 1873, pp. 129–30). The bull of Innocent was probably drawn up in the fifteenth century, for it does not appear in the *Mare Magnum* in the original, but as included and confirmed in one of Nicholas V. in 1448, for which purpose and at which time it was probably produced. Sixtus, moreover, in the final part of his bull, describes the Rule as having been confirmed by Innocent IV., Alexander IV., and Nicholas IV., showing that the confirmation by Honorius had not as yet been thought of (Sixti PP. IV. Bull. *Dum attenta* §§ 14–15, 113).

The forgers of the bulls, both of Honorius and Innocent, made an ugly blunder in giving the date of 1171 to the Rule granted by Albert. Alberto Avvogadro became Bishop of Bobbio in 1184, in 1185 he was translated to Vercelli, and in 1205 to Jerusalem. The Carmelite historians, however, make nothing of shifting the date from 1171 to 1205, and introducing another prior general, Berthold, to fill the gap and transfer Brocard, to whom it purports to be granted, to the next century.

The bull of Honorius III. served its purpose, in 1600, in procuring from the Rota a decision in favor of the Carmelites, granting them, on the score of greater antiquity, precedence over the Order of St. Mary of Mercy. The latter was recalcitrant at Cagliari, giving rise to great scandal, wherefore, in 1602, Clement VIII. issued a brief to coerce them, which had to be repeated in 1604.—Pittoni Constt. Pontificales T. VIII. P. II. n. 1328, 1412, 1602.

join one which had already been approved.[1] In the face of this, for the Carmelites to establish themselves required them to demonstrate that they came within the charmed circle of those which had previously been confirmed. To this all their efforts were bent, and nothing was neglected which unscrupulous ingenuity could suggest. By the assiduous labor of generations, from that time to the present, a monstrous structure of fiction has been built up, the unreality of which has been repeatedly exposed without chilling the resolute ardor of its defenders or shaking the credulity of their disciples. The scattering hermits of the mountains and deserts of Palestine have been multiplied and organized into a regular monastic body, affiliated upon the incompatible Greek monasticism of Palestine and tracing an uninterrupted descent from the Judaism of Elijah and Elisha. To take advantage of the constantly augmenting cult of the Virgin Mary, the Order represented itself as specially devoted to her and assumed the name of the Brethren of the Blessed Virgin of Mount Carmel. To substantiate these claims a work was fabricated and attributed to John, the forty-fourth Bishop of Jerusalem, who flourished early in the fifth century, in which he speaks of himself as a member of the Order, deduces its transmission from Elijah and proves that its members were Christians from the beginning and devoted to the Virgin nine hundred years before she was born, her future existence and her motherhood of Christ having been divinely revealed to Elijah and secretly handed down by tradition through the Order.[2] They asserted that the Order was con-

[1] C. Lateranens. IV. Can. 13.

[2] Johann. Hierosol. De Institutione primorum monachorum in lege veteri exortorum Cap. 11–15, 17–21, 28–9, 31–8. In the little cloud rising out of the sea to break the three-years' drought (III. Kings XVIII. 44) God revealed to Elijah a premonition of the coming of Christ and his birth of a Virgin, an exegesis since adopted generally by Carmelite writers.

Crazy as is this book, it is not badly conceived for the purpose designed. The date of its production is uncertain, but the earliest reference to it that I have met is in a sermon delivered, in 1342, by Richard of Armagh, and quoted by Thomas of Walden (De Sacramentalibus Cap. 189, n. 4).

The authenticity of the work has been denied by the highest authorities. Baronius goes out of his way to stigmatize it as a fable easily refuted. No author, he says, contemporary with John of Jerusalem knows anything of Carmelites in Palestine; the story is on the same plane as the claim that Cyril of Alexandria was a Carmelite (Annal. ann. 444, n. 17). Bellarmine is equally

firmed in 1180 by Alexander III., and, in 1199, by Innocent III., and that in 1219 Honorius III. granted them the convent of St. Julian ad Montes in Rome.[1] In 1476 they procured from Sixtus IV. confirmation of four bulls in their favor by Innocent IV., of eight by Alexander IV., of three by Urban IV., and of four by Clement IV., all of which may confidently be pronounced spurious as antedating the council of Lyons in 1274.[2] Not content with this, in 1477 they obtained from Sixtus confirmation of indulgences running from seven to thirty years for assisting them, which they claimed had been granted to them in the ninth, tenth, and eleventh centuries by Stephen V., Leo IV., Adrian II., Sergius III., John X., John XI., Gregory V., Sergius IV., and Gregory VI., besides numerous others of the twelfth century, all the originals having been lost.[3] There were no bounds to the drafts which they made on the public credulity. In the seventeenth century a quarrel arose between the Carmelites of Siena and Florence as to the priority of their respective establishments. The Sienese displayed, in support of their claim, a charter granted to them by Charlemagne. The

---

emphatic; the book apparently is written by an author of much later date; he calls himself a Carmelite and describes the Carmelite habit, though the name of Carmelite was clearly unknown in those times (De Scriptoribus Ecclesiasticis sub Joanne Episc. Hierosol.).

Still the Carmelite writers serenely continued to refer to the work as an incontrovertible proof of their descent from Elijah and an authentic account of the early history of the Order.—Quilici, Il Profeta d'Abelmuela, 72, 95, 122, etc. (Lucca, 1682). A modern work assures us that the popes, St. Telesphorus (A. D. 137) and St. Dionysius (A. D. 269), were Carmelite anchorites, and that Antony, Hilarion, Pacomius, Basil, Jerome and Chrysostom were connected with the Order.—Jouhanneaud, Dict. des Indulgences p. 695.

[1] Serrada, Escudo del Carmelo, p. 308 (Madrid, 1768).—Mariani Vintimiglia Hist. Chronol. Ord. B. V. de Monte Carmeli, pp. 5, 9, 10, 11 (Neapoli, 1773).

[2] Sixti PP. IV. Bull. *Dum attenta*, 1476. This is the bull which the Carmelites term their *Mare Magnum*, or great ocean of privileges. I quote it from the copy printed in the official collection issued by the Barefooted Carmelites, Madrid, 1700. At the same time I would remark that the bull *Dum attenta*, bearing the same date of Nov. 28, 1476, printed in the *Bullarium Romanum* (T. I. p. 405), is less than one-tenth the size, being a simple confirmation of that of Innocent IV., Eugenius IV., and Pius II., with a few added privileges. It is possible that the *Mare Magnum* was a subsequent compilation, put together for the confirmation which it received, in 1595, from Clement VIII., and that its ascription to Sixtus IV. is wholly supposititious.

[3] Sixti PP. IV. Bull. *Dum attenta*, 1477.

Florentines promptly capped this by hanging up a tablet on which was inscribed a copy of an attestation which they professed to have in their archives, manufactured for the purpose by a Polish brother of the house, setting forth that their church was founded, in 743, by seven Carmelites driven from the Holy Land by the Saracens.[1]

This rage for antiquity was not at first a matter of pride, but of self-preservation, and having been once indulged became habitual, as every fraud had to be supported by others. The facts in the case would seem to be that the pressure of the constantly diminishing boundaries of the Latin kingdom of Jerusalem gradually forced the hermits to return to the West. In 1236 it was resolved to transfer themselves to Europe, and most of them returned In 1244 the prior, Alan of Britanny or England, with his next in rank, Simon Stock, abandoned Palestine with the rest and settled in England, where they fixed the seat of the Order. Their position in the Church was exceedingly precarious, in view of the Lateran prohibition of new Orders and the jealousy of rival organizations. The unexampled success of the Franciscans and Dominicans, the holiness which they had imparted to mendicancy, and the temptations at once of indolence and asceticism were filling Europe, especially in the temperate South, with hosts of wandering beggars and stationary

[1] Papebrochii Propylæi Antiquarii P. II. n. 9, 10. The learned Jesuit Papenbroek had no trouble in demonstrating the spuriousness of this document, which professed to be contemporary with the asserted foundation of the church. He also disproved the genuineness of an inscription in the Carmelite church at Boppard, on the tomb of a Prior Henry, with the date of 1118, on which they relied greatly. The stone was apparently genuine, but it had been placed in its existing position in 1603 (Ibid. n. 23–6). He likewise gives us a copy of a painting over the high altar in the cathedral of Salamanca, representing Elijah in the curious transversely striped habit of the early Carmelites, and another of a painting, placed, about 1620, in the Carmelite church of Louvain, representing Omar forcing the Carmelites to adopt this peculiar garment (Ibid. n. 28). It is said to have been changed to white by the chapter of Montpellier in 1287, by order of Honorius IV. The Premonstratensians, whose habit was also white, opposed this vigorously, but Boniface VIII., in 1295, confirmed it (Vintimiglia, pp. 53, 55, 57; Bonifacii PP. VIII. Bull. *Justis*, 1295, *ap.* Bullar. I. 174).

Papenbroek's destructive criticism forced the Carmelites to abandon the Florence tablet and Boppard inscription, but they boasted that he had not attacked their story that, in 1186, Subislaus, Duke of Danzic, founded a great monastery for them in that city (Vintimiglia, p. 5).

hermits, living on the simple reverence of the people, connected with no organization or recognizing only some self-appointed leader. The situation was disagreeable and might become dangerous, and the Church felt it necessary to find a remedy. The second general council of Lyons was called, in 1274, primarily to chase the elusive phantom of reunion with the Greeks, but one of its objects was to suppress all unauthorized religious Orders. The feeling on the subject is well illustrated by a zealous adherent of the Carmelites, who informs us that Thomas Aquinas was hastening to the council for the purpose of destroying them when God interposed, and he sickened and died on the road, while a Franciscan who accompanied him on the same errand was struck dumb when he attempted to speak before the pope.[1]

In the Lyons council neither side won a decisive victory, though the result shows that as yet the Carmelite Order was unrecognized, and that all the bulls in its favor of earlier popes so industriously fabricated are subsequent forgeries. The canon adopted suppressed all unauthorized Orders, but it admitted that the Augustinians and Carmelites were founded prior to the prohibition of the Lateran council, and therefore it allowed them to exist on sufferance until otherwise determined.[2] The immediate danger was thus evaded, but the situation remained perilous, and the jealousy of rival organiza-

[1] Giachetto Malespini Historia Fiorentina Cap. 223 (Muratori S. R. I. VIII. 1042). This passage Muratori tells us had been suppressed in the printed edition of the chronicle. First, the Carmelites circulated such stories, and then, when it became undesirable to let it be known that the Angelic Doctor and saint was hostile to them, they endeavored to conceal it.

Giachetto's uncle, Ricordano, in reporting the result at Lyons, asserts that the Carmelite Order was confirmed there (Ibid. Cap. 199), in this doubtless only repeating false rumors disseminated by the brethren.

[2] C. Lugdunens. ann. 1274, Cap. 23 (Harduin. VII. 715). "Ceterum Carmelitarum et eremitarum Sancti Augustini ordines, quorum institutio prædictum generale concilium præcessit, in suo statu manere concedimus donec de ipsis fuit aliter ordinatum."

It is worthy of note that in the canon law this clause is converted into a confirmation of the two orders, reading "in solido statu volumus permanere" (Cap. 1 § 2 in Sexto III. xvii.). Whether this change was knowingly made by Boniface VIII., in 1298, when he compiled the Sixth Book, as asserted by the Carmelite annalists (Vintimiglia, p. 63), or is a subsequent modification made in their interest, it would probably now be impossible to decide, though the evidence inclines to the latter.

tions might at any moment succeed in obtaining a papal decree of suppression. In 1282 this appeared to be on the point of accomplishment, for in that year the general, Pierre de Milhaud, petitioned Edward I. of England to interpose in their favor. He recited the action of the council of Lyons and the uncertainty in which it left them, and now, he said, this had been so construed as to threaten them with destruction. Against this they had no refuge or protection save in him, and they supplicate him to obtain from Martin IV. a construction of the canon that will release them from the captivity in which they exist. The fact that the Order thus far was essentially English doubtless inclined the king to listen to their prayer; he refused, indeed, to address the pope, but he ordered letters in their favor to be written to four of the cardinals.[1] This peril was escaped, but the Order remained unrecognized in spite of the assertion of Ptolemy of Lucca, in 1286, that Honorius IV. confirmed it,[2] and the equally confident one of the historians of the Order that the act was done by Nicholas IV., in 1289,[3] to say nothing of the favoring bulls by Nicholas IV., Boniface VIII. and Clement V., which they caused to be inserted in the *Mare Magnum* of Sixtus IV. We happen to have a letter written, in 1311, by Edward II. of England to Clement V., highly commending the Order and asking that in the approaching council of Vienne it may be confirmed and perpetuated,[4] which shows that no such action had as yet been taken, nor did the council of Vienne grant the royal request. It was probably not long after this that the Dominican Pierre de la Palu refers to the Carmelites and Augustinians as *ordines reprobati*, and asked where they obtained the privilege of hearing confessions, which they persist in doing, in spite of the prohibition of the council of Lyons.[5]

---

[1] Rymer Fœdera II. 221–2. One of the cardinals was Hugh of Evesham, then recently promoted, who is claimed by Pierre de Milhaud as especially favorable to them.

[2] Ptol. Lucens. Hist. Eccles. Lib. XXIV. Cap. 14 (Muratori, S. R. I. XI. 1191).—Raynald. Annal. ann. 1286 n. 36.

[3] Vintimiglia, p. 53.—Thomas of Walden (De Sacramentalibus Cap. 89, n. 10) prints letters in favor of the Carmelites from prelates of the East and from the Grand Masters of the Hospital and Temple, but they are probably spurious, as they are dated respectively in 1272 and 1284, and are addressed to Pope Boniface VIII., whose pontificate did not begin until 1294.

[4] Rymer Fœdera III. 276.

[5] P. de Palude in IV. Sentt. Dist. XVII. Q. iv. Art. 3.

The persistent and multitudinous forgeries of the Carmelites render all their documents so suspect that it is impossible to pronounce with certainty when the long-sought for and long-delayed confirmation of the Order was actually obtained, but I am inclined to accept as genuine a bull of John XXII., dated March 13, 1317, decreeing the permanence of the Order and taking its possessions under his protection.[1] This would seem to be confirmed by an application in the same year by Edward II. to the pope, asking that the Carmelites be empowered to receive twelve grants of land in England and to found on them churches and convents.[2] The natural result of confirmation, and of the increased obtrusiveness which must have followed, was increased resistance on the part of rival organizations, rendering papal intervention requisite to insure to the newly admitted Order the enjoyment of its privileges, and, in 1319, John was obliged to create "conservators" for its protection. Those appointed in Italy were the Archbishop of Milan and the Bishops of Asti, Padua, Piacenza, Bologna and Ferrara; in England, the Archbishop of Canterbury and the Bishops of London and Bath; in Germany, the Archbishop

[1] Johann. PP. XXII. Bull. *Ordo sacer vester* in Sixti PP. IV. Bull. *Dum attenta* § 11 (Diplom. Frat. de M. Carmeli, p. 39). The Carmelites rank last of the four mendicant Orders, which would show that the Augustinians were confirmed before them. To reconcile this with their asserted recognition by Honorius III. they pretend that he confirmed all four—Dominicans, Franciscans, Augustinians and Carmelites.—Camillo d'Ausilio Sommario dell' Origine della Religione Carmelitana, p. 37 (Brescia, 1603).

[2] Rymer Fœdera III. 610–11. Vintimiglia tells us (pp. 65, 69) that in 1314 Edward, when in imminent danger at Bannockburn, vowed to found and endow a theological college for twenty-four Carmelites, which he fulfilled at Oxford in 1318, but there is no record of such a grant in Rymer.

During their struggle for existence in the thirteenth century the Carmelites appear to have been strangers to the intellectual movement of the age. It is recorded of Gerard Sereni, elected general in 1297, that he was the first Carmelite who had lectured in the University of Paris (Vintimiglia, p. 61). Subsequently nearly all the generals were men holding academical honors, and the Order numbered among its members theologians of repute, such as Gui de Terrena, Jean Alère, William of Coventry, John Baconthorpe, Thomas of Walden etc.

To escape this reproach we are assured that S. Simon Stock devoted special attention to the training of the brethren, that he was a learned man and prolific writer, but that unfortunately all his works have perished save two little canticles attributed to him.—Mattei, Ristretto della Vita di S. Simone Stock, pp. 34–5 (Roma, 1873).

of Salzburg and the Bishops of Passau and Regensburg. In the same year Pope John authorized it to found convents everywhere in Germany, Bohemia, Hungary and Norway, which shows that the Order was establishing itself and spreading rapidly.[1]

It could no longer be persecuted and threatened with extinction, but its pretensions to descend from Elijah and to be the oldest religious Order created constant antagonism and led to bitter quarrels. These were especially rife in the seventeenth century, when Launoy and Papenbroek brought to the investigation their boundless stores of learning, leading to a controversy so sharp that, in 1698, Innocent XII. was impelled to impose silence on the disputants. No one was allowed to discuss the question of the origin of the Order, any books or tracts on the subject were to be placed on the Index, and this was to remain without prejudice to either side until the Holy See should decide otherwise.[2] In 1725, however, Benedict XIII. practically decided the question in favor of the Carmelites when he permitted them to erect in St. Peter's, among the statues of founders of Orders and patriarchs, one of Elijah with an inscription framed by himself to the effect that the Carmelites have erected this to their founder St. Elijah the prophet.[3]

Something more was needed for the prosperity of the Order than the confirmation and recognition obtained, in 1317, from John XXII. It had ceased to be eremitic, and in becoming mendicant it found the ground fully occupied by the great organizations of St. Francis and St. Dominic. Possibly the success of the Portiuncula may have suggested the next step taken to bring it into notice and secure it adherents. It had no saint of pre-eminent sanctity like Francis to conjure with, but a substitute was found in Simon Stock, the Englishman, who is said to have been elected general in 1145. His legend relates that he was born in Kent, in 1065; a consuming thirst for maceration drove him from his father's house at the age of twelve to dwell in a hollow tree for twenty years, subsisting on wild herbs and bread brought to him by dogs on stated days. At

[1] Vintimiglia, p. 71. We may reasonably doubt the enthusiastic assertion of modern writers that by the year 1300, while, as we have seen, it was yet existing on sufferance, it numbered 7500 convents and 125,000 members.—Jouhanneaud, Dict. des Indulgences, p. 700.

[2] Pittoni Constitt. Pontificales, T. VIII. P. II. n. 4078.

[3] Vintimiglia, Præfat.

length some Carmelites chanced to pass that way; he joined them, studied theology at Oxford, and gradually rose to be the head of the Order at the ripe age of eighty years. In 1251, as the story goes, on the night of the 15-16th of July, while praying to the Virgin to aid the struggling brethren, she appeared to him with a great retinue, holding in her hand the habit of the Order, and said, "This shall be the privilege for thee and for all Carmelites: whosoever dies in this shall not suffer eternal fire."[1] No reference occurs to this for nearly a hundred years after the occurrence, when, in 1348, William of Coventry made it public. Even as late as 1450 Felix Hemmerlin classes the Carmelites and their new scapulars with the Lollards and Begghards as guilty of mortal sin through their impudent pretensions.[2] Apparently the device had not the success anticipated, for, in 1494, Jan van Oudewater, a Dutch Carmelite, better known by his Hellenized name of Palæonydorus, struck a most productive vein by the happy thought of adding to the Virgin's promise "Behold the sign of salvation, safety in danger, the covenant of peace and of the sempiternal pact."[3] It was this afterthought that has rendered the Carmelite scapular so all-powerful an amulet occupying so large a share in the popular belief of modern Catholics.[4]

---

[1] Vintimiglia, pp. 24, 29, 32.—"Hoc erit tibi et cunctis Carmelitis privilegium; in hoc quis moriens æternum non patietur incendium."

According to Carmelite documents S. Simon at once reported, in a letter dated from Cambridge, this miraculous grace of the Virgin to all the communities of the Order.—Maffei, Vita, p. 43.

[2] "Et quodam habitu novæ religionis cum scapulari præsumptuose necnon impudenter utentes mortaliter peccare."—Fel. Hemmerlin Dyalogus de anno Jubileo, p 4*b* (Ed. 1497).

[3] Vintimiglia, *loc. cit.*—"Ecce signum salutis, salus in periculis, fœdus pacis et pacti sempiterni."

[4] Strictly speaking, the scapular or *armilausa* (Macri Hierolex. s. v. *Armilausa.*—S. Isidori Hispal. Etymolog. Lib. XIX. Cap. xxii. n. 28) is a monastic garment worn over the cope, covering the shoulders and hanging down before and behind. It was formerly also used as a penitential vestment, worn by pilgrims (Astesani Summæ Lib. v. Tit. xxxiv. Art. 1, Q. 1), and the Carmelites sought to trace it back to the Hebrew Ephod (Serrada, Escudo del Carmelo, p. 4). When its virtues caused it to be extensively used by laymen it shrank to the more convenient shape of two oblong pieces of cloth, united by tapes and worn under the garments, one piece on the breast and the other on the back. It requires benediction, which must be performed by a priest of the Carmelite Order—even a bishop is unable to do it (Decr. Authent. n. 96), and

The account of the Vision purports to be drawn from a life of St. Simon Stock, written, in 1267, by his secretary, Peter of Swanington,

is placed on the shoulders of the applicant with certain ceremonies (Gelasii de Cilia Locupletissimus Thesaurus, Ed. 1744, p. 119), which admit him to the Carmelite confraternity. The Golden Book of the Confraternities (p. 95) says that by a decree of Gregory XVI., in 1838, no record need be kept of the membership, but the Congregation of Indulgences decided, in 1842 (Decr. Authent. n. 562), that a record must be made and transmitted to the authorities of the Order, and then again, in 1868 (n. 774), it decided that this does not apply to the Carmelite scapular, but only to those of other Orders. It however affirmed, in 1857 (n. 709), that a man can throw off the scapular and subsequently resume it without further ceremony or reception. Yet to enjoy its full benefit, when once assumed, it is never to be laid aside. It is related of Leo XI., elected in 1605, that, when his cardinal's garments were removed to invest him with the papal robes, one of the prelates took hold of his scapular to take it off, when he forbade it, saying "Sine, desine Mariam ne me desinat Maria" (Guglielmi, Recueil des Indulgences, p. 147), but as he died after a pontificate of twenty-six days his caution does not seem to have been effective. In 1655 it served Alexander VII. better, for on his way to the conclave in which he was elected he stopped at the Carmelite convent and received the scapular at the hands of the general. The common belief is that when one is worn out or broken it can be replaced by a new one that has not been blessed, but Serrada (Escudo del Carmelo, pp. 336–7) holds that this is an error; the virtue resides in the benediction, and even the breaking of both tapes requires blessing when repaired.

The virtue of the scapular, however, does not depend wholly on the benediction, but on minute details of form and material and mode of wearing, without strict observance of which it is inert. Some of these details were settled in a decree of the Congregation of Indulgences in 1862 (Decr. Authent. n. 747), but, in 1868, a full congregation of the cardinals was held to consider the profound questions whether the scapular must be made of wool or whether cotton is permissible; whether, if made of wool, it must be woven or can be knitted or embroidered, and if embroideries can be of another color or material, such as gold or silver thread; whether the old quadrangular shape is imperative, or whether the recent innovations of round and oval are allowable; whether, finally, the laudable custom of combining the several scapulars by superimposing them, one on another, is imperative, or whether the modern fashion is admissible of having only one cloth, on which are woven or embroidered in different colors the symbols of the several scapulars. All these weighty matters were maturely considered with the assistance of a consultor, and the Most Eminent Fathers decided that wool is indispensable and cotton inadmissible; weaving is requisite, and knitting and embroidery must be rejected, but embroidery on wool can be allowed, even with foreign substances, provided the prevailing color be preserved; the old quadrangular form is not to be changed, and in multiple scapulars the stratified structure is to be observed. All this

to whom he related the occurrence. This life, though quoted by one Carmelite writer after another, was long supposed to be lost, and did not see the light until the seventeenth century, when, during a violent controversy over the truth of the story, it was found, with that opportuneness which distinguishes Carmelite documents, in the archives of the Order in Bordeaux by the prior, Jean Cheron, and printed by him in his *Vindiciæ Scapularis*.[1] It is deplorable to think that even this did not convince the opponents of the Order, who continued to denounce the story as a figment.[2] The opposition was led by the learned Jean Launoy, whose tract on the subject, issued in 1642, was not put on the Index until 1690, with many of his other iconoclastic works,[3] and the Carmelites summoned to their assistance one of the most distinguished Jesuits of the day, Théophile Raynaud, who urged the repeated confirmation of the Vision, the wearing of the scapular by kings and popes, and the innumerable miracles which had attested its virtues, and he triumphantly pointed out that, if evidence be required to prove the truth of tra-

---

was submitted to the pope, who in about a month confirmed it (Decr. Authent. n. 772). This affords a salutary warning as to the minutiæ on which the fate of body and soul may depend.

It seems remarkable that questions of the kind should remain to be settled at so late a date. In 1838 the Carmelite General was obliged to decide that the form of a single cloth hanging on the breast was irregular. Those wearing such scapulars were members of the confraternity, but they must conform to the regular pattern (Jouhanneaud, Dict. des Indulg. p. 732). In 1840 the Congregation of Indulgences was appealed to to know whether the fashion of wearing them under the arms was admissible, when it replied in the negative —they must be worn so that the cloths rest on breast and back (Decr. Authent. n. 516, 518), though it is not essential that they should be next to the skin (n. 694); as for the exact tint it is indifferent, provided it is a shade of brown or black (n. 517). In 1841 Archbishop Doney of Bordeaux represented that from time immemorial the faithful had been accustomed to wear scapulars of two pieces of cloth sewed together and hanging on the breast, that it would be very difficult to change this custom, and that it would cause much perturbation of the faith; he therefore asked that this form be recognized as a true scapular; if this be refused he prayed that similar privileges be granted to it. In reply the pope cured the defect of the brethren received with the single scapular, but the archbishop was instructed to arrange prudently that in future the regular double form alone be used (Jouhanneaud, pp. 733–4).

[1] Benedicti PP. XIV. De Festis Lib. II. Cap. vi.

[2] J. B. Thiers, Traité des Superstitions, T. IV. p. 253 (Paris, 1704).

[3] Innocent. XI. Indicis Append. p. 32.

dition, all the traditions on which the ecclesiastical structure was based, unsupported by documents, must be swept away. Had he foreseen the miserable ending of the reign of Louis XIV. perhaps he would have forborne to attribute the glory of its opening years to the monarch's use of the scapular.[1]

Raynaud was justified in his line of defence, and the Carmelites could afford to regard with indifference the assaults of their enemies, for the Church had accepted the Vision as a fact by authorizing its recital in the office for the feast of St. Simon Stock, May 16, as approved by the Congregation of Rites. It was also included in the office of Our Lady of Mount Carmel, July 16, and this office was gradually extended throughout the Catholic world—to Venice in 1704, to the Tarvisina in 1714, and finally, at the request of Louis XV., Benedict XIII., in 1726, ordered its recitation everywhere by all Christians of both sexes who are bound to the observance of the canonical hours. Benedict XIV., moreover, expressed his belief in it.[2]

Yet in accepting the Vision as an undoubted fact the Church exercised praiseworthy caution as to its essential feature—the promise of the Virgin that those who wear the Carmelite garment shall escape eternal fire. The men who framed the legend were simply desirous of appropriating for their Order the wide-spread popular belief that a man who should die in a monkish habit would be saved, but they expressed this too crudely to be acceptable to skilled theologians, and thus they overshot the mark. It would seem impossible to admit the truth of the Vision and reject this portion of it, and yet this is what the Breviary does, prudently if not logi-

[1] Theop. Raynaudi Scapulare Partheno-Carmeliticum, Colon. 1658, pp. 130, 257. The first edition appeared in Lyons in 1653.

If we are to believe Feller (Dict. Hist. s. v. *Raynaud*) the incurable tendency to dishonesty of the Carmelites so modified this work that when it appeared in print Raynaud disavowed it, which did not prevent them at his death from paying him funeral honors in all their convents.

[2] Raynaudi Scap. Parth. Carmel. p. 20.—Pittoni Constitt. Pontificales, T. I. P. II. n. 1551, 1728, 1894.—Benedicti PP. XIV. De Servorum Dei Beatificatione Lib. IV. P. ii. Cap. 9, n. 4.—Ejusd. De Festis Lib. II. Cap. 6.

Yet it would appear that St. Simon was never regularly canonized. In 1671 Clement X. commenced proceedings for the purpose, but abandoned them as superfluous, for the Carmelites claimed that his Office had been approved in 1277, by Nicholas III.—Maffei, Vita, pp. 54–55.

cally,[1] for it could not accept the theory that the Virgin can promise pardon for the *culpa* of sins simply on condition of wearing the Carmelite habit, or the scapular which took its place as a more convenient article of attire. Raynaud attempts to reconcile the difficulty by arguing that the scapular is a sign of predestination.[2] Others suggest that the Virgin operates in two ways to preserve her devotees from hell—by gaining for them aid to die in grace, or, if they die in mortal sin, by obtaining that they shall be restored to life and be enabled to repent and be saved.[3] In proof of this there are endless miracles related. As early as 1252 a noble of Winchester, who was a notorious sinner, blasphemed and was impenitent on his death-bed. His brother brought to him St. Simon Stock, who, after praying, cast his garment upon the dying man. The latter was immediately converted, made a most edifying end, and after death appeared to his brother and reported that the habit had proved a shield against Satan.[4] This would seem to interfere seriously with free-will, but such an objection does not lie against the well-authenticated case of Antonio, a soldier on board the Santa Teresa, in the fleet under the Duke of Aveyro, in 1665. He died September 20th, after confession and absolution, and was prepared for burial at sea, but during the night awoke the crew by shouting for his Carmelite confessor, Fray Camilo de Alzamora. When the latter was brought he explained that he had been condemned to hell for a mortal sin forgotten in confession, but by the intercession of the Virgin, in consideration of having worn the scapular for twenty years and fasted on Wednesdays and Saturdays, he had been permitted to return and confess it, which he did and immediately expired. This case, again, casts unpleasant doubts on the efficacy of absolution for forgotten sins, but there is another one, free from all complications, of a man murdered by an enemy, who cut off his head and rolled it down a

---

[1] Bened. PP. XIV. De Festis *loc. cit.*—Guglielmi, Recueil des Indulgences Authentiques, p. 132 (Paris, 1873).

As I shall have further occasion to quote the Abbé Guglielmi's book, I may mention here that it bears the approbation of the Congregation of Indulgences, March 7, 1863.

[2] Raynaudi Scap. Parth. Carmel. pp. 125, 252.

[3] Serrada, Escudo del Carmelo, pp. 51–2 (Madrid, 1768).—Golden Book of the Confraternities, pp. 107–14.

[4] Vintimiglia, p. 35.

mountain. The head cried out unceasingly for a confessor till the relenting murderer brought one, who was so disturbed by the cries that he refused to listen to the confession till the head was brought back to the body. When this was done they immediately reunited; the corpse leaped with joy and confessed a long catalogue of crimes. When asked by the confessor how it had, though so great a sinner, merited so great a favor, it replied that it had always worn the scapular and fasted on Wednesdays and Saturdays, and with that it expired—the moral teaching of which case we will not examine too closely.[1]

While thus there is a decided incompatibility between the absolute promises of the Vision and the received theories as to the pardon of sin, this antagonism is not without its attendant advantages from a practical point of view. It enables the writers of popular works of piety to copy the words so emphatically pronounced by the Virgin and to point out that this has been confirmed by the Congregation of Rites in its repeated approbations of the Carmelite breviary, under the investigation of such men as Cardinals Bellarmine and de Torres,[2] and that it has been accepted by popes and universities. Whatever may follow after this of cautionary exhortation as to the practice of virtue can only leave the impression on the uninstructed reader that it is merely the prudent reserve of the individual moralist seeking the moral elevation of his flock.[3] It would be impossible for any one to recite believingly certain passages in the novena of Our Lady of Carmel without acquiring a conviction that the scapular is itself a pledge of salvation.[4]

[1] Serrada, Escudo del Carmelo, pp. 106–10. The benefit of the Scapular is dependent on recitation of the Little Office, or, for those who cannot do this, fasting on Wednesdays and Saturdays, but this latter can be commuted for prayers or "almsgiving."—Ibid. pp. 200, 333–4.

[2] Decreta Authentica Congr. Sac. Rituum n. 704, 1514.

[3] Jouhanneaud, Dict. des Indulgences, pp. 703, 705.—Golden Book of the Confraternities, pp. 89–90, 94. See, however, the more moderate expositions of Vintimiglia, p. 34, and Stanton's Menology of England and Wales, p. 213 (London, 1887).

[4] Thus in the prayers of the sixth day—"The holy Scapular which the Virgin has deigned to give us is a sign of salvation for the soul as well as the body; it guarantees and offers to the soul an efficacious refuge from our common enemies."

In the seventh day—"The sacred garment of Mary is terrible to demons;

The scapular thus is more than an indulgence, for it addresses itself directly to the *culpa* and not to the *pœna*, but the confraternities based upon it have been endowed with countless indulgences, as we shall presently see. Meanwhile some reference can scarce be omitted to the enormous increase of the value of the scapular in the popular mind wrought by the addition made, in 1494, by Jan van Oudewater to the original promise, when he introduced the idea that it would confer safety in danger. Amulets and talismans have been eagerly sought for in all ages and in all faiths, and Latin Christianity has always encouraged this belief and turned it to account in inculcating the preservative influence of relics and other sacred objects, legends concerning which form so considerable a feature of the hagiology of the Church. That the Scapular possesses such virtue has been industriously exploited by those interested, and forms a fixed article of faith in a large portion of the Catholic world. It is eloquently and comprehensively inculcated in the prayers of the novena of Our Lady of Carmel—"No one can sufficiently conceive the great virtues which you, O Mary, have granted to your vestment to perform miracles without number. Heaven, earth, and the elements have always been subjected to it and have always respected those who wear it with devotion. . . . The most terrible tempests sink into perfect calm . . . men buried at the bottom of wells and in the abysses of the ocean are found to be living . . . men fall from the tops of towers and of trees without a bruise, are struck by red-hot cannon-balls without injury, lightning loses its power, conflagrations have no heat. . . . The most obstinate diseases and death itself yield to the powerful virtues of this holy garment. There is no prodigy that it does not perform, no grace

---

merely at sight of it these furies of hell, beaten and helpless in their malice, fly and plunge themselves in the depth of their abysses like wild beasts seeking to hide themselves in their dens from the sun. . . . How beautiful it will be to see, at the terrible moment of death, the good brethren of Carmel, drunken with joy, conversing deliciously with the Blessed Virgin, and thanking her for having numbered them among her children."

In the ninth day—"If it is impossible for him who lives and reposes under the protection of the Mother of Mercies ever to fall into eternal perdition, what have we, O Mary, to fear for our bliss, since you have long ago settled with God, in favor of your brethren, the contract of their deliverance from the fires of hell?"—Guglielmi, *op. cit.* pp. 221, 224, 227.

that it does not win, no suppliant that it does not console."[1] This so completely sets forth the virtues of the scapular in temporal affairs that the reader may be spared a selection from the countless authentic cases which the industry of pious writers has compiled to illustrate its miraculous powers in every conceivable contingency — though it must be admitted that Father Huguet makes a trifling mistake when he attributes Edward II.'s victory at Bannockburn to the wearing of a scapular by that pious prince.[2] What impresses one particularly in reviewing these marvels is that, like the rain of heaven, they fall on the good and the evil alike, and that innocence and guilt or even faith are matters of no consequence.

The inventive genius of the Carmelites, however, did not exhaust itself on the Vision of Simon Stock and the scapular. These saved in life and from hell, and to render the gifts of the Order complete something equally efficacious was wanting to obtain control of purgatory. This was found in the celebrated Sabbatine Bull. The legend of the Order relates that in the disgraceful conclave which, in 1316, finally put an end to the long interregnum after the death of Clement V., Cardinal Jacques d'Ozo addressed his earnest prayers to the Virgin that the choice might fall on him. His devotion was rewarded with a vision in which the Mother of God promised him the tiara on condition that he would publish certain graces conceded to the Carmelite Order and confraternity by Christ. The next day he was elected, taking the name of John XXII., but he seems to have been in no haste to keep his word, for, although there are two versions of the date of the Sabbatine Bull, the earliest places it nine months after his installation and the later one nearly six years—a

[1] Guglielmi, Recueil des Indulgences, pp. 220–1.

[2] Le R. P. Huguet, Vertu miraculeuse du Scapulaire, Paris, 1872, pp. 10–11. —See also Serrada, Escudo del Carmelo, pp. 165–304; Guglielmi, *op. cit.* p. 137; Jouhanneaud, *op. cit.* pp. 702, 709–10; Golden Book of the Confraternities, pp. 119–126.—Grassi, Narrazione dell' Indulgenze etc. concesse all' Ordine del Carmine, pp. 29–31 (Roma, 1807).

We are assured that not only Edward II. wore the scapular as a member of the confraternity, but St. Louis, Henry Duke of Lancaster, Henry Count of Northumberland, Angela, daughter of the King of Bohemia, and a host of other royal and noble personages.—Camillo d'Ausilio, Sommario, p. 41. In view of his miserable end the prominence accorded to Edward II. as a wearer of the scapular indicates the customary ignorance of English history.

discrepancy which the advocates of the Order vainly seek to explain.[1]

The bull itself—*Sacratissimo uti culmine*—is wild and emotional, almost unintelligible, a document such as never emanated from the papal chancery, and peculiarly incompatible with the hard and practical character of John XXII., which is so clearly visible in his authentic utterances. It relates how the Virgin told him to concede, what Christ had ordered in heaven, that all who enter the Order shall be saved; those who join the confraternity shall be relieved of a third part of their sins on their promising to observe chastity according to their state; the brethren professed are released both from punishment and *culpa*, and finally the Virgin promises that every Saturday she will descend to purgatory, liberate those whom she finds there and carry them back to the holy mountain of eternal life, but the members of the confraternity must recite the canonical hours, according to the rule of St. Albert, or, if too ignorant, must observe the fasts of the Church and abstain from meat on Wednesdays and Saturdays, except when Christmas occurs on one of those days. This holy indulgence John accepts, ratifies and confirms on earth even as granted by Christ in heaven on account of the merits of the Virgin.[2]

---

[1] Vintimiglia, pp. 66, 74.—Raynaudi Scap. Parth. Carmel. pp. 15-16, 167.—Guglielmi, p. 139.—Serrada, p. 92.

[2] I have followed the version given in the official collection of the Barefooted Carmelites, Madrid, 1700. There are variants, some of them important. In the papal confirmation the older reading makes John describe the indulgence as granted by the Virgin—"ab ea." This was a serious error, as the Virgin has no power to perform an act incompatible with her sex, so the *ab ea* was quietly dropped (Raynaudi *op. cit.* pp. 204-6). In the final recension the formula adopted is that given in the text. This is also the version printed by Amort, *De Indulgentiis*, I. 147. In the earlier form, moreover, John is made to confirm the Order as well as the indulgence—an admission which was shrewdly stricken out.

The pledge to release from *culpa* as well as *pœna* occurs in all the recensions, offering a difficulty which Raynaud (pp. 208-9) vainly endeavors to explain away.

The Virgin's promise to liberate from purgatory reads "Et die quo isti ab isto sæculo recedunt properatoque gradu accelerant purgatorium, Ego Mater Gloriosa Gratiæ et Misericordiæ descendam Sabbato post eorum obitum et quos inveniam in purgatorium liberabo et eos in montem sanctum vitæ æternæ reducam."

This power ascribed to the Virgin shows the late date of the fabrication of

As a matter of course no original of this remarkable document has ever been produced, though Friar Thomas Bradley, in the fifteenth century, is said to have seen it in London, and, in 1661, Father Augustinus a Virgine Maria asserts that an authentic copy exists at Rennes. The official explanation is that it was preserved in the archives of the Order in England, where it perished in the Reformation, unless it may yet be lying there in some unknown corner.[1] What is presented in place of the original is a bull of Alexander V., December 7, 1409, embodying it,[2] but even this is not to be found in the original, though we are told that there is an authentic copy at Avignon.[3] It is said to have been delivered to Alfonso de Theramo, prior of the Carmelite convent at "Chapteriensis" in England, to be kept in the archives, and presumably disappeared in the Reformation.[4] The shape in which it reaches us is two-fold. A transcript is said to have been made of it in Majorca, in 1421, but even this is not produced (though it is said to be preserved in Genoa), but instead of it two notarial copies made in Sicily, one dated 1430 and the other 1432, from which subsequent copies were preserved in the convents of the Order, one of 1502 at Valencia, one of 1605 at Toledo and one of 1606 at Medina del Campo. Then there is another transcript attested, in 1633, by Maria Antonio Franciotto, Apostolic Prothonotary, who asserts that the original bull of Alexander V. was submitted to him in a perfect state with the seals, and of this a further transcript was made, in 1639, at Louvain.[5]

---

the bull. Towards the middle of the fifteenth century the Blessed Peter of Palermo, in treating of indulgences, says that the Virgin cannot grant them, for she has not the keys. Had the Sabbatine bull been current at the time he could not have argued thus.—Petri Hieremiæ Quadragesimale, de Peccato, Serm. XXVII.

[1] Serrada, *op. cit.* p. 98.—Amort de Indulgentiis I. 144.—Vintimiglia, p. 74.

[2] Of this there are two recensions; one is a simple *vidimus* by Alexander, authenticating the act of his predecessor; the other contains an implied confirmation of the indulgence.—Diplomata Frat. Discalc. Ord. B. V. M. de Monte Carmeli, pp. 10, 17.

[3] Jouhanneaud, Dict. des Indulg. p. 723.

[4] Vintimiglia, p. 74. Of course if either of these bulls could be found in the papal registers Carmelite industry would have long since discovered and published them. An effort has been made to explain the absence of that of John XXII. by suggesting that the anti-pope Benedict XIII. carried it to Peniscola, but the registers of the Avignonese popes are in Rome.

[5] Diplomata, pp. 8–11, 16–18.—Vintimiglia, *loc. cit.*

The fabrication of the document can, I think, be assigned with reasonable probability to the early part of the sixteenth century. Had it existed in 1476 it would unquestionably have been embodied in the *Mare Magnum* of Sixtus IV. (supposing that bull to have really been issued at that time), for the latter contains five comparatively trivial letters of John XXII., and this could not possibly have been omitted. On the other hand, it must have been put together prior to the forgery of the confirmation bull of Honorius III., for it speaks of the Order having been confirmed by Innocent IV. Everything points to its having been prepared with the view of obtaining confirmation from Clement VII. and thus authenticating it. To bridge over the interval of two centuries since its date, some intermediate confirmation appeared essential, and Alexander V. was doubtless chosen, because his short and troubled pontificate of ten months seemed to offer less chance of detection.

If the object of the fabrication was to obtain its confirmation by Clement VII., it was not entirely successful. That Pontiff indeed, in 1524 or 1528, did, in the bull *Dilecte fili*, confirm the Sabbatine Bull, with its promise from the Virgin to visit purgatory on Saturdays and liberate the souls of the brethren, but the contest with heresy had rendered theologians keener and more cautious; these monstrous assumptions were recognized as inadmissible, and, in 1530, Clement VII. issued another bull superseding the former. This recited that the refrigescence of charity rendered the Carmelites unable to keep their churches in repair, and therefore, to stimulate the faithful, all who should lend a helping hand should enjoy the numerous privileges bestowed on the Order. Among these is included the Sabbatine Bull, wherein John XXII. and Alexander V. remitted one-third of their sins to those joining the confraternity and promising to observe its conditions, and, moreover, the Virgin would help their souls after death with her continual intercession, pious suffrages and special protection.[1] When Gregory XIII., in 1577, confirmed the privileges of the Order he was careful to use the same guarded

[1] Guglielmi, p. 139.—Vintimiglia, p. 186.—Bullar. I. 685.—The modified form of the liberation from purgatory is "Ac ipsa gloriosissima Dei Genetrix, semper Virgo Maria, ipsorum Confratrum seu Religiosorum ac Sororum animas post eorum transitum, suis intercessionibus continuis, piis suffragiis et speciali protectione adjuvabit."

terms.[1] As in the case of the Vision of Simon Stock, a compromise was reached whereby the vision was recognized as a fact and the promises of the Virgin were ruthlessly cut down, a result more creditable to the diplomacy than to the candor of the Holy See.

It is probable that the Carmelites had little scruple in availing themselves of the confirmation of the Sabbatine Bull without much reference to the restrictions on its promises, for opposition sprang up which required them to obtain further confirmations, by Paul IV., in 1534, and Pius V., in 1566. The latter seems to have been called for by an extensive hostile movement in Spain, led by the prelates and based on a report that the privileges of the scapular and the Sabbatine Bull had been abrogated by the council of Trent. The matter was referred to the University of Salamanca, which decided in favor of the Order.[2] Still more serious was the trouble when, in 1609, the Inquisition in Portugal and at Avignon prohibited the teaching of the Sabbatine Bull. An appeal, supported by the influence of Philip III., was made to the Holy Office at Rome, and, after a prolonged discussion, in 1613 a decree was issued, confirmed by Paul V., following the lines laid down by Clement VII., that it might be taught and piously believed that the Virgin helps, especially on Saturday, by her suffrages the wearers of the scapular who observe the conditions, so that they are sooner liberated, while a final clause prohibiting pictures representing the Virgin as descending to purgatory shows how little the Carmelites had allowed themselves to be bound by the compromise of 1530.[3] Similar caution was observed in the office of Our Lady of Mount Carmel, where the assistance of the Virgin to souls in purgatory is merely stated as a pious belief.[4] Something was gained, in 1673, when the Carmelites procured from

[1] Maffei, Vita di S. Simone Stock, p. 151.

[2] Serrada, p. 100.—Vintimiglia, p. 193.—Jouhanneaud, pp. 173-4.—Maffei, p. 154.

[3] Amort de Indulg. I. 145 —Vintimiglia, pp. 77, 211.—Raynaudi *op. cit.* pp. 19, 203.—Serrada, p. 101.—With characteristic dishonesty the final clause of the decree is omitted from it as printed in the official collection of the Barefooted Carmelites, p. 13, and by Maffei, p. 155.

In 1624 the Sorbonne compelled the Carmelite Pierre Arcis to revoke his error in ascribing to the Virgin power over the souls of the departed, based on her promise to John XXII.—D'Argentré, Collect. Judic. de Error. II. II. 161.

[4] Benedicti PP. XIV. De Festis Lib. II. Cap. vi.—Maffei, Vita di S. Simone Stock, p. 97.

Clement X. the confirmation and approbation of their summary of indulgences, including the old forgeries from Leo IV. down. In the clause concerning the Sabbatine Bull, Clement VII. is represented as approving the letters of John XXII. and Alexander V., and as confirming and rendering perpetual the indulgences and graces and remissions of sin therein granted to those wearing the habit and joining the confraternity.[1] The phrasing of this is evidently drawn with much care to justify all the claims of the Sabbatine Bull without apparently departing from the limitations adopted by Clement VII. Yet even after this the French theologians, following the lead of Launoy, had no hesitation in expressing their disbelief in the genuineness of the Sabbatine Bull and their contempt for it, while Benedict XIV., who twice had occasion to allude to it, was conspicuously careful to avoid any clear revelation of his opinion on the subject.[2]

The matter has thus been skilfully left so that the Carmelites can claim the full benefits of the Sabbatine Bull for all who assume the scapular and join their confraternity, while the Church can appeal to the decree of the Inquisition of 1613 and the cautious phraseology of the breviaries, and thus relieve itself of responsibility for the doctrinal errors contained in the promises of the Virgin. The writers of manuals for popular instruction have therefore no hesitation of assuring the devout of the absolute certainty of the Saturday liberation of the souls of all who enter the confraternities and observe the rules. Serrada even argues that those who fulfil the conditions with zeal may reasonably hope that the Virgin will not wait till Saturday, but will release them sooner; it is fatuous, he says, to think that a meritorious brother who dies on Sunday will have to wait till Saturday; that term is only for those who merit longer torment, and he has ample store of miracles and visions to prove that the weekly liberation takes place regularly.[3] Guglielmi, after giving a garbled

---

[1] Clement. PP. X. Bull. *Commissa nobis*, 1673 (Bullar. T. VI. Append. p. 45).

[2] J. B. Thiers, Traité des Superstitions, T. IV. pp. 253–55.—Bened. PP. XIV. De Festis Lib. II. Cap. vi.; De Servorum Dei Beatificatione Lib. IV. P. ii. Cap. 9, § 14.

Father Noël Alexandre (Hist. Eccles. Sæc. XIII. et XIV. Diss. XI. *ad calcem*) has tersely given the reasons, historical, critical and doctrinal, which prevent his acceptance of the bull as genuine.

[3] Serrada, Escudo del Carmelo, pp. 134–7, 321–22. On the other hand, to enforce the necessity of the observances required, he relates a vision in which a

history of the bull interprets the decree of the Inquisition, in 1613, as permitting the Carmelites to publish the privilege conferred by the Virgin on all who wear the scapular, namely, that it is a certain pledge of safety in the dangers of life, a powerful aid to a good end and an infallible preservative against the flames of purgatory, especially on the Saturday after death, all of which is summed up in the line "Protego nunc, in morte juvo, post funera salvo."[1] The "Golden Book of the Confraternities" gives the absolute promise of the Virgin to descend to purgatory on Saturday and deliver the souls of the brethren, and adds "These are the very words of the bull . . . which has been approved by Pope Alexander V., Clement VII., Pius V. and Gregory XIII." After this it can safely quote the more cautious utterances of the Inquisition and the breviary without danger of weakening the confidence of the devotee.[2] Even Bishop Bouvier admits the descent of the Virgin and her liberation of souls on Saturdays, though he conveys the impression that he would be glad to deny it if he could.[3]

Yet notwithstanding these pre-eminent privileges, which would seem to supersede the necessity of others, the Carmelites steadfastly kept alive all the interminable line of spurious indulgences from the ninth century onwards, the confirmation of which it so carefully procured from Sixtus IV. and Clement X. One of these is justly characterized by their own writers as the most extraordinary of all indulgences, stupefying those who consider it. It purports to have been granted by Urban VI., and offers three years and three quarantines to any one who will speak of the Order as that of the Virgin of Mount Carmel, or who on seeing a Carmelite will say, "Behold

Carmelite soul begs for suffrages, and explains that there are few who gain the indulgence of the bull on account of their neglect.—Ibid. pp. 139, 142. The moral of this is that it will not do to omit providing for mortuary masses in reliance on the scapular.

Grassi agrees with Serrada that the Virgin does not wait till Saturday to liberate the souls of the brethren.—Narrazione dell' Indulgenze etc., Roma, 1807, pp. 33–4.

[1] Guglielmi, Traité des Indulgences, pp. 139–40.

[2] Golden Book, pp. 96–99, 106.

[3] Bouvier, Traité des Indulgences, p. 296. That there still are those who doubt the authenticity of the Sabbatine Bull is seen in the heated defence of its genuineness which Padre Mattei appends to his "Ristretto della Vita de S. Simone Stock," Roma, 1873.

a brother of the most glorious Virgin Mary"—and not content with this we are told that Nicholas V. doubled it and then added seven years and seven quarantines, so that it consists in all of thirteen years and as many quarantines. Guglielmi may well urge every one to gain at so easy a rate such remission of purgatorial pains.[1] In addition to all this a summary, issued in 1603, of the indulgences obtainable by members of the brotherhood in Rome amounts to four hundred and five plenaries during the year and the liberation of sixty-five souls, together with the indulgences of the Stations of Rome, of Jerusalem, and of Compostella, to say nothing of partials amounting to hundreds of thousands if not millions of years.[2]

This hasty review of the development of the Portiuncula and scapular may serve to indicate the tendency which existed towards the close of the middle ages to multiply indulgences *per fas et nefas*. They were like a debased currency, constantly falling in value, the productiveness of which can only be maintained by correspondingly enlarged issues. The profusion with which the jubilee and the so-called crusading indulgences were poured forth after the time of Boniface IX. vulgarized the system, while the insatiable appetite of the people, eager to avoid the penalties of sin without surrendering its enjoyments or undergoing the restrictions and hardships of penance, furnished an inexhaustible market for the dispensers of the treasure of the Church. The indulgence, which in its earlier period was an exceptional incentive to liberality or to the performance of arduous service, was rapidly becoming an essential part of the ecclesiastical system and as much a matter of course as any of the ordinary observances of religion. The change which thus gradually effected itself is well illustrated by the contrast between the ten days offered by Innocent IV. for prayers for St. Louis when a prisoner in the hands of the Saracens and the plenaries granted by Leo X., on the occasion of the coronation of Francis I., in 1515, to all who would

[1] Raynaudi Scap. Parth. Carmel. pp. 38–9.—Clement PP. X. Bull. *Commissa nobis* (Bullar. VI. Append. p. 45).—Guglielmi, Traité des Indulgences, pp. 129, 160.—Grassi, *op. cit.* p. 74.

Serrada explains this indulgence by a story that in Chester the people persecuted the Carmelites for styling themselves Brethren of the Virgin until during a procession an image of the Virgin pointed to them and said, "See, those are my brothers."—Escudo del Carmelo, pp. 80–2.

[2] Camillo d'Ausilio, Sommario dell' Origine della Religione Carmelitana, pp. 87–156 (Brescia, 1603).

attend high mass on the first, second or third Sunday in Lent and pray for his health and prosperity.[1] The process, however, was gradual until towards the close of the fourteenth century, when probably the Great Schism assisted in breaking down all restraint. Even as late as 1359, when "the priests' emperor," Charles IV., begged for an indulgence for a chapel in his castle of Carlstein, where he had assembled particles of the true cross, one of the nails and a piece of the sponge of the Crucifixion, a thorn from the crown of thorns and numerous other relics, all that Innocent VI. granted to it was seven years and quarantines, and even this could be gained only once a year.[2]

In this development the activity of the religious Orders continued, both as to the graces obtainable by their members and those which contributed to their wealth and influence by reaching the laity through their churches and organizations. The amount of concessions of all kinds which they accumulated is almost beyond computation, and to present even a partial enumeration would tax the reader's patience too severely. I have alluded above to one granted to the Observantine Franciscans, the Clares and the Tertiaries, by Leo X., by which all the indulgences, plenary and partial, of the churches of Rome, Jerusalem, Compostella, and Assisi were obtainable by a few recitations of the Pater, Ave, and Gloria Patri before the sacrament with arms outstretched; then these conditions were relaxed and the prayers could be recited anywhere, at any hour of the day or night and in any position, and this moreover *toties quoties* —as often as the devotee chose to repeat it and apply it to a soul in purgatory. All this was multiplied indefinitely by repeated bulls admitting all the regular Orders to the privileges conferred on any one, so that each profited by the assiduity and inventiveness of all the others in procuring these graces. In every way papal liberality was exploited to stimulate for them the veneration and lavishness of the people. John XXII. is said to have granted five years and five quarantines to all who should kiss the habit of a mendicant friar. To Clement IV. is attributed a remission of one third of all sins to those who died and were buried in the Franciscan habit, and those who sought this were expected to pay for the habit—not the indul-

[1] Hergenröther, Leonis PP. X. Regesta n. 13791, 14628.

[2] Werunsky, Excerpta ex Registris Clem. VI. et Innoc. VI. p. 137 (Innsbruck, 1885).

gence—a fitting "alms." Finally Urban VIII. empowered the provincials and superiors of the Franciscans to apply to all benefactors of the Order all its suffrages, indulgences, prayers and spiritual benefits, and this, we are told, is the modern practice.[1]

When plenaries came to be distributed with so prodigal a hand it can readily be imagined that partials were no longer restricted to the few days or years which were so eagerly sought in the earlier period. There has been a disposition in modern times to call in question the genuineness of indulgences for tens and hundreds of thousands of years on the ground that popes never could have issued them, and that the satisfaction due even by the greatest sinners could never extend to terms so prolonged.[2] We may grant with van Est that they are absurd, but we must also admit with Bishop Bouvier that at any rate they are less than plenaries, and that if the latter can be granted so can the former.[3] It is true that as they were remissions of so many years of penance they had no real significance beyond that of making an indulgence speculatively attractive, though possibly it might be assumed that ignorant folk regarded the remission as that of so many years of purgatory, and these enormous terms served a double purpose of impressing timid souls with the prospect of what would seem a virtual eternity and at the same time offering them an easy means of escape.

Doubtless many of the pardons of this kind freely hawked around were fraudulent, but I can see no reason to question that generations which would frame and accept belief in the scapular and Sabbatine Bull would be equally ready to grant and to seek these exaggerated indulgences. A vernacular English account of the "Stacions of Rome," drawn up about the year 1370, enumerates the enormous indulgences offered by the hundred and forty-seven Roman churches, of which two or three will serve as examples. We learn that at St. Peter's, from Holy Thursday to Lammas (August 1st), there is a daily indulgence of 14,000 years, and whenever the Vernicle (Sacro Volto) is exhibited there is one of 3000 years for citizens, 9000 for

[1] Ferraris Prompta Biblioth. s. v. *Indulgentia*, Art. v. n. 1–9, 18–43, 71–6. —Amort de Indulg. I. 154–60.

[2] Dom. Soto in IV. Sentt. Dist. XXI. Q. ii. Art. 1.—Estii in IV. Sentt. Dist. XX. § 10.—Benedicti PP. XIV. De Synodo Diœces. Lib. XIII. Cap. xviii. § 8. See also Zerola's awkward attempt to explain them away (Tract. Jubilæi ac Indulg. Lib. I. Cap. xxi. Q. 7).

[3] Bouvier, Traité des Indulgences, pp. 28–9.

Italians and 12,000 for pilgrims beyond the sea. At San Anastasio there is one of 7000 years every day, and at San Tommaso one of 14,000 years, with one-third of sins for all comers.[1] Evidently the growth had been rank in the two centuries since Peter Cantor (p. 198) specified the modest two or three years to be gained in Rome on Holy Thursday. No papal documents could be produced to authenticate these extravagant promises, but they continued to be openly published from generation to generation, and to attract pilgrims from every part of Christendom, with the full knowledge and acquiescence of successive popes, so that they were at least tacitly confirmed, and the Holy See could not escape responsibility for them.[2] It is true that Gerson suggests that all such excessive

[1] The Stacions of Rome, pp. 3, 4, 8 (Early English Text Society, 1867). See also pp. 30 sqq. for a later prose recension of this, of the last quarter of the fifteenth century. There is also a longer metrical version of the middle of the fifteenth century in the "Political, Religious and Love Poems" issued, in 1866, by the Early English Text Society. Evidently such advertisements of the attractions of Rome as a place of pilgrimage were widely and industriously disseminated during the later middle ages. Mr. Rossetti, in his notes to the earliest of the above (p. xv.), alludes to a German block-book of nearly 200 pages, entitled *Mirabilia Romæ*, apparently intended to perform the same service in Germany.

[2] Benedict XIV. admitted the responsibility incurred by tacit acquiescence when, in 1751, he confirmed on this account all the indulgences claimed by the church of St. John Lateran, although there was no evidence to prove their genuineness (Bened. PP. XIV. Const. *Assiduæ solicitudinis*, § 7, 6 Maii, 1751). The Lateran was perhaps the boldest of the Roman forgers. Among other frauds it displayed a tablet stating that Sylvester I. granted plenary remissions of all sins to all visiting it at any time; that Gregory I. confirmed this on rebuilding the church after its destruction by heretics (!), and that Boniface had declared that "The Indulgences of the Lateran church cannot be counted save by God alone, and I confirm them all" (Ferraris Prompta Biblioth. s. v. *Indulgentia*, Art. VI. n. 24).

This claim was as old as the fourteenth century. The earliest version of the Stacions of Rome says—

> Pope silvester thenne seide he
> Of peter and poul and of me
> Thei schal be clene of synne and pyn
> As crist clanset the of thyn,
> And as the fulthe fel fro the
> So clene of sunne schal thei be (p. 9).

The tablet was not displayed in the church till the close of the sixteenth century. Onofrio Panvinio, in 1568, in his elaborate description of the Lateran

indulgences may be fictions of the pardoners, for purgatory will end with the end of the world,[1] but the popes had no hesitation in making equally liberal distribution of the treasure. In 1513 Leo X. granted to the Servite chapel of St. Annunciata at Florence, that all visiting it on Saturdays should obtain a thousand years and as many quarantines, and double that amount on the feasts of the Virgin, Christmas and Friday and Saturday of Holy Week.[2] Even after the council of Trent had enjoined moderation in dispensing the treasure, Pius IV., in 1565, granted to the members of the confraternity of the hospital of St. Lazarus—besides several plenaries and the indulgences of Santo Spirito in Saxia and the stations of Rome, the jubilee and the Holy Land—a year and a quarantine for every day, 2000 years on each of the feasts of the Apostles, 100,000 years on Epiphany and each day of the octave, 3000 years and as many quarantines with remission of one-third of sins on every Sunday, 2000 years and 800 quarantines on Christmas, Resurrection, and Ascension and each day of their octaves, 8000 years and 8000 quarantines on Pentecost and each day of the octave, 2000 years and one-seventh of sins on Corpus Christi and each day of the octave, 30,000 years on the Nativity of the Virgin and each day of the octave, 3000 years and 3000 quarantines on All Saints and each day up to St Leonard's (November 1 to 6).[3] When such reckless prodigality was possible after the council of Trent had called a halt there is no reason to question the validity of pre-Reformation indulgences simply on account of their excess. Miguel Medina had not long before justified this liberality by the argument that indulgences cover the penance that ought to be enjoined as well as that which is enjoined; no man knows what this is, nor anything about the duration of purgatorial punishment, nor even what are the years of purgatory, and therefore the popes have acted wisely and prudently in granting these prolonged terms in order to make men feel

---

and all its inscriptions (Le Sette Chiese di Roma), makes no mention of it; but about 1600 Rodriguez describes it (Explicatione della Bolla della S. Crociata, p. 94).

[1] Jo. Gersonis Opusc. de Indulg. Decima Consid.

[2] Amort de Indulgent. I. 163.

[3] Pii PP. IV. Bull. *Inter assiduas*, §§ 143–5 (Bullar. II. 158). Pius V., on his accession, confirmed these privileges, but in 1567 he greatly reduced the portentous indulgences.—Bull. *Sicuti bonus*, § 62 (Ibid. p. 226).

safe.[1] Lavorio adduces the indulgences of 15,000 or 20,000 years as proof of the extent of purgatorial suffering which hardened sinners may expect, and Polacchi argues that they should not seem absurd or incredible when we reflect that a single day in purgatory corresponds to many years of the fiercest bodily anguish during life.[2] About the year 1700 Viva tells us that the church of S. Maria Maggiore enjoys a daily indulgence of 12,000 years from Assumption to the Nativity of the Virgin (August 15th to September 8th), while Ferraris explains that if the cause for the grant is insufficient, an indulgence for 300,000 years may be good only for a thousand, and we shall see hereafter, when we come to consider the Stations of Rome, how recklessly these enormous concessions were multiplied.[3] A recent manual of devotion asserts, on the authority of Liguori, that there is an indulgence of 3800 years for hearing mass, and the members of the confraternity of Our Lady of Consolation enjoy one of a thousand years.[4]

With this multiplication and extension of pardons they became a sort of current coin with which the Church paid for any service that it might require. As was jocularly remarked in reference to the leaden seals appended to the bulls, the pope accomplished what the alchemists only attempted, for he changed lead into gold.[5] If he desired to make good his claims on any attractive piece of territory contiguous to the Patrimony of St. Peter or to reduce to submission a recalcitrant vassal, the offer of an indulgence would speedily raise an army to effect his purposes. The curia was always in need of money, and, as we have seen, the one unfailing resource was a cruzada or a jubilee, offered at a steadily diminishing price as time wore on and the market grew slack, or, as it was found that reduced cost increased the number of purchasers. Nor were these or the "almsgiving" to churches and convents the only objects, for indulgences came to be issued for the most varied and incongruous purposes. From

[1] M. Medinæ Disput. de Indulg. Cap. xlviii.—Pagni, Trattato dell' Indulgenze, Firenze, 1588, p. 12.

[2] Lavorii de Jubilæo et Indulg. P. II. Cap. x. n. 28.—Polacchi Comment. in Bull. Urbani VIII. p. 116.

[3] Viva de Jubilæo ac Indulg. p. 53.—Ferraris Prompta Biblioth, s. v. *Indulgentia*, Art. II. n. 36.

[4] Golden Book of the Confraternities, p. 282.—Beringer, De Ablässe, p. 55.

[5] Hemmerlin, Recapitulatio de anno jubileo (Ed. 1497, q 3).

an early period, as we have seen, the building and repair of bridges and roads were regarded as appropriate motives, and the resource was too facile and too inexhaustible not to be extended further. When, in 1229, Raymond of Toulouse, by one of the articles of the Treaty of Paris, was required to found a university in his capital, as one of the means of eradicating heresy, the nascent institution, in a circular addressed to teachers and students everywhere, informs them that among its advantages is that, by the liberality of the cardinal legate, it is enabled to offer a plenary indulgence to all professors and scholars.[1] When, in 1367, Cardinal Albornoz died and his body was to be carried from Viterbo to Toledo, the gratitude of Urban V. for the territories which the martial legate had recovered for the Holy See expressed itself in the offer of a plenary to every one who on the long journey would lend a hand to carry the bier for however short a distance.[2] When, in 1514, the Lateran council adopted a severe decree against blasphemy it offered to judges for every conviction an indulgence of ten years and one-third of the fine—a mingling of spiritual and temporal bribery not conducive to even-handed justice.[3] In 1515 we find Leo X. appointing Adrian of Utrecht commissioner in the whole of the Low Countries for the sale of a plenary to raise money for the repair of the dykes.[4] There was perhaps a flavor of the crusades in plenaries granted in 1513 to encourage privateering against Turkish commerce and corsairs, but this does not apply to so gross a prostitution of the treasure as an indulgence, in 1514, offered to all visiting any cathedral church in England and contributing to the rebuilding of Norham Castle, which

---

[1] Denifle, Chartularium Universitatis Parisiensis, I. 129–31.—"Erat enim Moyses noster dominus cardinalis et legatus in regno Francie dux et protector et auctor post Deum et dominum papam tam ardue inchoationis, qui statuit quod omnes Tholose studentes et magistri et discipuli, omnium peccaminum suorum indulgentiam consequantur."

I cannot but feel some doubt as to the exactitude of this offer. The power of legates to issue indulgences was, as we have seen (p. 168), very limited, and at this period plenaries were strictly reserved for crusades. Possibly however the office of teaching and learning orthodox theology amid the heretic population of Toulouse may have been regarded as a continuation of the Albigensian crusades.

[2] Sepulvedæ Rer. Gest. Ægid. Albornot. Lib. III.

[3] C. Lateran. V. Sess. IX. (Harduin. IX. 1755).

[4] Hergenröther, Regest. Leonis PP. X. n. 17421.

had been destroyed the year before by the Scots in the Flodden campaign.[1] If the favor of Henry VIII. was to be purchased in this way, it was equally easy to bestow marks of papal benevolence on influential personages, as in the personal indulgence granted, in 1514, to Bernardo de Villamarin, Viceroy of Naples, his wife and children and all reciting certain prayers in his chapel, and to Alonso Pimentel, Count of Benavente, his wife and children and all visiting his chapel.[2] We even find territorial indulgences, such as one granted by Alexander VI., at the instance of Iñigo de Cordova, ambassador of Ferdinand and Isabella, to the town of Baena, which had distinguished itself in the war with Granada, and this, in 1513, Leo X. extended for twelve years to all the population within twelve leagues of Baena.[3] When we add to such as these the plenaries which were lavished apparently on every church that applied properly for them, and those which the Holy See was selling everywhere for its own benefit, we can appreciate the truth of Gröne's admission when he says "All sluices of church indulgences were thrown open and the Bride of Christ let her treasures of grace stream over her faithful and contrite children as though from an inexhaustible cornucopia. Unfortunately the recipients were not always so disposed as to derive the wished-for fruits of salvation from the benevolence of the Church."[4]

The evils of this indiscriminate and reckless outpouring of the treasure were aggravated by the system adopted to extend the sale of pardons and reap the profits thence accruing. To render them fully productive it was necessary that they should be carried around and their benefits be fully explained to the faithful, who were exhorted to perform the service or give the "alms" which would procure them. As early as 1118, in the indulgence offered to those who would contribute to the necessities of the new bishopric of Saragossa, Bishop Pedro despatches his archdeacon Miorrand on this errand and promises that God will grant eternal life to those who hospitably receive him and his companions.[5] Of course the manner

[1] Ibid. n. 7745, 7750, 9889.
[2] Ibid. n. 11636, 11639. Cf. n. 6834, 7648, 7806.
[3] Ibid. n. 3561.
[4] Gröne, Der Ablass, p. 76.
[5] Blanca, Aragonensium Rerum Comment. p. 140.

in which this duty was performed depended upon the character of those commissioned. Men like St. Bernard, Foulques de Neuilly and Conrad of Marburg, who were empowered to "preach the crusade," as it was called, would do it irreproachably and with the object rather to inflame the religious ardor of the people than to gather in money, and yet where money was concerned it was impossible to keep out the baser elements and to prevent scandals. Even Foulques de Neuilly, who in three years had imposed the cross on 200,000 pilgrims and had collected immense sums, did not wholly escape, for though he remitted large amounts to Palestine, he was said to have retained a portion, and he evidently considered it subject to his control, for we are told that on his death, in 1202, he bequeathed it to the crusade.[1]

The system of hiring preachers of indulgences must have become well established and its abuses patent when, in 1212, the council of Paris endeavored to control it by forbidding any one to serve for pay, whether he carried relics with him or not, except for a proper cause and with episcopal letters; moreover the device of letting or farming out districts to such persons, which inevitably led to the grossest evils, was strictly prohibited.[2] Sometimes these *quæstuarii*, as they were called, carried relics, through the virtue of which they deceived the people with lying promises of pardon, sometimes they bore indulgences, and sometimes both. Cæsarius of Heisterbach, who characterizes them as swindlers, relates how, when the monks of Bruweiler desired to enlarge their church, some covetous priests obtained from them the precious relic of a tooth of St. Nicholas and carried it around the land, deceiving the people, till the saint, becoming indignant at their indecent conduct, broke the crystal of the reliquary, and the good monks recalled it and resolved that it should never again be allowed to leave the monastery.[3] How these gentry con-

[1] Joannis Iperii Chron. ann. 1201; Rad. de Coggeshall. Chron. ann. 1201; Rob. Altissiodor. Chronolog. ann. 1202; Chron. Anon. Laudens. ann. 1199 (Dom Bouquet, XVIII. 601, 93, 265, 711).

[2] C. Parisiens. ann. 1212, P. I. Cap. viii. (Harduin. VI. II. 2002).

[3] Cæsar. Heisterbacens. Dist. VIII. Cap. 67, 68. Chaucer's description of the pardoner with his false relics and cozening ways is well known (Canterbury Tales, Prologue). See also Piers Plowman, Prologue, 68–79, and Sir David Lyndesay's "Satire of the Thrie Estaits" (Ed. Early English Text Soc. pp. 453–55).

This practice of carrying around relics was already an old one. About 970

ducted themselves is indicated by a letter of Innocent III., in 1198, to the Archbishop of Lyons, who had complained of those acting for the Hospitallers; they had beaten the vicar of a church to the effusion of blood, and when the archbishop had interdicted the church until it should be reconciled they had continued to have divine service performed in it; they permitted priests suspended by their bishops to perform their sacred functions; though illiterate laymen, living with their wives or leading disorderly lives, they asserted their claims to privileges and immunities, and refused to be responsible to the laws of the land; in short, they evidently were a peculiarly disreputable and dangerous element in the community.[1] The council of Lateran, in 1216, sought to repress all these scandals. It ordered the bishops to see that the people were not deceived, as they were in so many places, by figments and false documents, that relics should not be taken from their places and hawked around to make money, and that the quæstuarii should be decent and economical, avoiding taverns, not wearing the habit of Orders to which they did not belong, and not promising anything but what is set forth in their commissions, and that they should not be received unless they bore letters from the pope or the bishop of the diocese.[2] From this time forward the councils everywhere throughout Europe were constantly occupied with the subject, giving ample evidence of the evil reputation of the clerics who followed the trade of pardoner, of the fruitless effort to keep them in restraint and to check their mendacity and extortion, while at the same time in many cases we have inklings that the bishops wished no interference with their profitable rights of issuing indulgences, and that the priests used their positions to share in the proceeds. Occasionally drastic measures were devised, as when, about 1266, Clement IV. decreed that priests were not bound to receive them in their houses or to provide them with necessaries or to assemble the people to listen to them, even if required to

---

Thietmar of Merseburg relates (Chron. Lib. IV. Cap. 47) that Abbot Liudulf of Corvey sent out a young monk with some relics of martyrs; he treated them negligently, wherefore the indignant martyrs slew him and reported the matter to Liudulf, who had some trouble in procuring pardon for the soul of the delinquent.

[1] Cap. 11 Extra, Lib. V. Tit. xxxiii.—Innoc. PP. III. Regest. Lib. I. Epist. 450.

[2] C. Lateran. ann. 1216, Cap. 62.—Cap. 14 Extra, Lib. VI. Tit. xxxviii.

do so in their letters, and that any excommunication thereby incurred was invalid.[1] The council of Salzburg, in 1274, went even further when it suspended all indulgences on account of their evil influence, chiefly arising from the quæstuarii, who led the people into error and caused the keys to be despised.[2] We need scarce be surprised at this if we may believe the utterance of the council of Mainz, in 1261, which denounced the quæstuarii as infamous liars, skilled in all wickedness, whose tongues know nothing but falsehood, and who abuse the word of God for filthy gain. They often exhibit as relics the profane bones of men and beasts, they invent miracles, their eyes are trained to weep, and with haggard faces, loud clamors and pitiful gestures they set forth their wares and promise remission of sins in such fashion that scarce any one can restrain himself from purchasing, to the destruction of discipline, for there are few who will accept penance from their priests, believing, or at least asserting themselves to be absolved from their sins by such indulgences. And the gains thus stolen from the Church are spent in drunkenness, feasting, gambling and lechery. These pestiferous men are ordered to be perpetually banished from the province; they are to be arrested wherever found and brought before the bishop, while, if any church requires assistance for repairs, the bishop shall send letters to the priests of the diocese setting forth the case and the indulgence offered, and the money so collected shall be conveyed to the church in need. How futile were these admirable regulations is seen by the provisions of a subsequent council in 1301, which orders all such persons to be suspended until they should be examined carefully and be furnished with new credentials.[3] Quæs-

[1] Clement. PP. IV. Extrav. *Sedis apostolicæ* (Jo. Friburgens. Summæ Confess. Lib. III. Tit. xxxiv. Q. 194).

[2] C. Salisburgens. ann. 1274, Cap. 6 (Dalham Concil. Salisburgens. p. 119).

[3] C. Mogunt. ann. 1261, Cap. 48; ann. 1301, Cap. 7 (Hartzheim III. 612–13, IV. 96).

It is scarce worth while to accumulate passages on this subject from the conciliar proceedings. The student who desires further details can find them in C. Narbonnens. ann. 1227, Cap. 19 (Harduin. VII. 148).—C. Sanquintanum, ann. 1231, Cap. 7 (Gousset, Actes etc. II. 359).—C. Biterrens. ann. 1246, Cap. 5 (Harduin. VII. 409).—C. Cenomanens. ann. 1248 (Martene Ampl. Collect. VII. 1330–1).—C. Burdegalens. ann. 1255, Cap. 2, 9 (Harduin. VII. 470).—C. Monspeliens. ann. 1258, Cap. 6 (Ibid. p. 507).—C. Claromontan. ann. 1268, Cap. 11 (Ibid. p. 603).—N. Gelant. Episc. Andegavens. Synod. X.

tuarii were a necessity for pecuniary indulgences, and all efforts to restrain them or do without them were fruitless, for, no matter what wholesome rules might be devised by diocesan and provincial synods, there were always greedy prelates and needy churches to disregard them. As the council of Salzburg, in 1456, complains, a pardoner would buy for a livre a commission from a church, on which he would collect forty or fifty livres a year and squander the money in filthy dissipation.[1] Those, moreover, who bore papal letters and travelled with a retinue of clerks and confessors were not easy to restrain, and had no scruple in resorting to forcible means when the local priesthood endeavored to keep them within bounds. In 1433 the priests of Freisingen appealed to the council of Bâle for protection against the quæstuarii of the Knights of St. John, who had come armed with indulgences granted by Martin V. and Eugenius IV. and insisted on extending the powers of their letters in various ways, absolving the people *a culpa et a pœna*, threatening all who interferred with them with suspension and excommunication and

ann. 1270, Cap. 2; Synod. XXI. ann. 1277, Cap. 4 (D'Achery I. 730, 733).—C. Budens. ann. 1279, Cap. 27–8 (Harduin. VII. 798).—Constit. Gualtheri Episc. Pictaviens. ann. 1280, Cap. 10 (Ib. p. 854).—Statuta Cadurcens. c. ann. 1289, Cap. 13 (Martene Thesaur. IV. 692).—Synod. Remens. ann. 1303 (Martene Ampl. Collect. VII. 1364).—Statut. Cameracens. c. ann. 1310 (Hartzheim IV. 93).—C. Ravennat. ann. 1314, Cap. 20 (Harduin. VII. 1391) —Synod. Carnotens. ann. 1325, Cap. 18; ann. 1368, Cap. 53 (Martene Ampl. Coll. VII. 1366, 1399).—Statuta Cadurcens. ann. 1330, Cap. 8 (Martene Thesaur. IV. 689).—Statut. Eccles. Suessionens. ann. 1350, Cap. 19 (Gousset, Actes etc. II. 579).—Statut. Joh. Archiep. Remens. ann. 1362 (Ibid. p. 605).—Statut. Anton. Episc. Minorcens. ann. 1368 (Villanueva, Viage Literario XXI. 7).—Statut. Petri Archiep. Tarraconens. ann. 1372 (Ibid. XX. 7).—Statut. Petri Archiep. Tarraconens. ann. 1410 (Ibid. p. 204).—Nueva Recopilacion, Lib. I. Tit. ix. ley 1.—C. Suessionens. ann. 1403, Cap. 105 (Gousset, II. 637).—C. Parisiens. ann. 1429, Cap. 27 (Harduin. VIII. 1048).—C. Frisingens. ann. 1440, Cap. 24 (Hartzheim V. 279).—C. Ambianens. ann. 1454, Cap. 3 § 10 (Gousset, II. 701).—C. Remens. ann. 1455 (Ibid. p. 736).—Statut. Capituli Ambianens. ann. 1465, Cap. 12 (Ibid. p. 743).—C. Arandens. ann. 1472, Cap. 13 (Aguirre, V. 347).—C. Tornacens. ann. 1485, Cap. 12 (Gousset, II. 768).—C. Bambergens. ann. 1491, Tit. 55 (Hartzheim V. 628).—C. Senonens. ann. 1524 (Bochelli Decret. Eccles. Gallican. p. 981).—C. Carnotens. ann. 1526 (Ibid. p. 982).—C. Biturícens. ann. 1528, Cap. 5 (Harduin. IX. 1921).—Edit de 1538 (Isambert, Anciennes Loix Françaises, XIII. 551).—Concilio de Coria, ann. 1537 (Barrantes, Aparato para la Historia de Extremadura, I. 473).

[1] C. Salisburgens. ann. 1456 (Dalham, p. 239).

stirring up disaffection among the people, doubly dangerous in view of the vicinity of the Hussites.[1]

These little eccentricities might be viewed with equanimity at headquarters so long as the proceeds were honestly accounted for, but men of the character employed in the business were apt to prefer their own gains to the interests of their superiors. We have seen how Boniface IX. treated his commissioners, and how violent were the means by which he forced them to disgorge. This must have been a not uncommon experience, for a Formulary of the fifteenth century contains a form suited to such occasions. In it the chief of the hospital of Santo Spirito describes how his quæstuarii, especially in Spain, had deceived the people by false promises, and how they had converted the receipts to their own use, wherefore he commissions his representative to follow them, seize all their belongings, equipages and money, arrest their persons, calling, if necessary, on the secular arm, and deposit all the property he obtains in safe hands.[2] Nothing is said as to punishing them for their frauds on popular credulity, for such offences were easily condoned if unaccompanied by the far more serious guilt of malversation. According to the taxes of Benedict XII. the scrivener's fee was only six *grossi* for absolution for selling indulgences on forged letters, as well as for pretending to be a priest and as such hearing confessions and administering the sacrament of penitence.[3]

The Church at large did little to second the efforts of local councils to purify the system. The popes, it is true, not infrequently, when

---

[1] MS. Hist. Frisingensis (Amort, II. 37–9). That the Freisingen priests were clearly within their rights under the canon law is evident from Bishop William Durand's summary of the mutual duties of the quæstuarii and local clergy.—Durandi Speculi Lib. IV. Partic. iv. De Pœnit. et Remiss. n. 1, 2. The Extravagant of Clement IV. releasing priests from all obligation of receiving pardoners and summoning the people to hear them continued to be quoted until the sixteenth century.—Summa Angelica s. v. *Quæstuarii;* Summa Sylvestrina s. v. *Quæstuarii.* Yet sometimes towards the close of the middle ages bulls of indulgences contained a clause excommunicating and suspending all parish priests and monks and friars who should interfere with their publication and preaching. For an example of this, in a grant to the church of Xaintes, see Appendix.

[2] Formularium Instrumentorum ad usum Curie Romane, fol. 32 (*sine nota*).

[3] Denifle, Die älteste Taxrolle der Apost. Pönitentiarie (Archiv f. Litt. u. K.-Geschichte, IV. 224–5.

granting indulgences, made it a condition that they should not be exploited through quæstuarii, and a clause to this effect is to be found in the formulary of the Avignonese papal chancery for indulgences conditioned on money contributions to churches;[1] but as they almost never adopted this precaution with those issued for the benefit of the Holy See the inference is clear that it was simply to prevent competition with their own agents and not from any desire to curtail abuses. The same motive may be ascribed to the power granted to inquisitors to coerce all preachers of indulgences. Gregory IX., in 1235, when sending Dominicans to preach the cross in Tuscany, ordered them to silence, by censures without appeal, any quæstuarii who should interfere with their success. Innocent IV., in 1253, granted the same power to those who in France were preaching the cross in aid of St. Louis, and Clement IV., in 1265, when organizing the crusade against Manfred of Sicily, gave the same authority to the preachers. The Inquisition, which by this time was in thorough working order, formed a convenient instrument for performing this function everywhere and at all times, and, in 1254, Innocent IV., when engaged in raising a crusading army against Ezzelin da Romano, included in the commission to inquisitors faculties for preventing quæstuarii from preaching, a clause which became usual in all such commissions, and finally became embodied in the canon law.[2] This power to silence them, if exercised with moderate vigilance, would have put an end to the lies and deceits with which they fleeced the people and disgraced the Church, and the fact that the Inquisition exercised no perceptible influence in checking these abuses, which continued unabated until after the Reformation, shows that the faculty was not designed for such use, but merely to prevent interference with the papal harvests.[3]

---

[1] The earliest instance I have met of this is in an indulgence granted to the cathedral of Aarhuus, in 1254, by Innocent IV. (Langebek et Suhm, Scriptt. Rer. Danic. VI. 391), and it is found occasionally thereafter, as in some of Clement IV. (Boletin de la Real Academia de la Historia XVI. 52.—Raynald. ann. 1268, n. 194), one of Honorius IV. in 1286 (Ripoll, II. 12), one of Benedict XI. in 1304 (Ibid. p. 98), and several of Clement V. in 1309 (Regest. Clement PP. V. n. 4747, 4762, 4829).—Tangl, Die päpstlichen Kanzlei-Ordnungen, pp. 331–2 (Innsbruck, 1894).

[2] Ripoll I. 82, 233, 242, 461.—Cap. 11, § 2 in Sexto, Lib. v. Tit. ii.

[3] I have met with but one case of the trial of a pardoner by the Inquisition

It is true that at the general council of Lyons, in 1245, the Archbishop of Reims was forbidden to grant to his quæstuarii, employed for the fabric of his cathedral, power of citing before the archiepiscopal court the subjects of his suffragans on the charge of resistance or disobedience, though it was added that the suffragans can kindly warn their subjects to give the pardoners a benignant reception, and the incorporation of this in the canon law indicates that the tyranny and extortion against which it was directed cannot have been uncommon.[1] At the next general council, held in Lyons in 1274, Humbert de Romanis, who had been General of the Dominicans, urged action on the subject, representing that the quæstuarii by their lies and uncleanness disgraced the Church and rendered it a subject of ridicule; they corrupt the prelates by bribery and are therefore allowed to say what they like; they gain much and pay over but little to the churches and they deceive the people with false relics.[2] The appeal was wasted and the council took no action. The council of Vienne, in 1312, was more energetic. It enumerated in vigorous terms the frauds and lies whereby the pardoners amassed gold, to the peril of souls and discredit of the Church; it ordered the provisions of the Lateran canon to be enforced, and the quæstuarii themselves to be examined before intrusting them with commissions; it withdrew all privileges on which they could base their excesses, and it exhorted the bishops to punish them when found guilty, without regard to their claims of exemption.[3] This was all well-devised legislation, but its enforcement was impossible in the corruption of the age and in the face of the numerous interests inextricably intertwined with the abuses of the system. John XXII. gave an example of how reform could alone be brought about when, on November 1, 1330, at the same hour, he caused throughout France

—that of Berenger Pomelli by Guillaume de Saint-Seine, in 1289, at Carcassonne. He was a poor varlet who made a livelihood by selling indulgences for local purposes. Had he been engaged on a crusading indulgence he would probably not have been interfered with. See History of the Inquisition in the Middle Ages, III. 623, 662.

[1] Cap. 1 in Sexto Lib. v. Tit. i.

[2] H. de Romanis de Tractandis in C. Lugdunens. P. III. Cap. 8 (Martene Ampl. Coll. VIII. 197).

[3] Cap. 2 Clement. Lib. v. Tit. ix.—Cf. Summa Pisanella s. v. *Quæstuarii*, n. 3.

all the brethren of the Hospital of Altopasso to be seized and thrown into the episcopal prisons because they exceeded in their promises the warrant of their papal letters.[1] At least this was the reason alleged, though we may surmise that some political motive connected with his struggle with Louis of Bavaria was rather at the bottom of his vigorous action, for we hear of no other victims, while the trade of pardon-selling continued to flourish unchecked.

At the council of Constance Cardinal d'Ailly presented an enumeration of the abuses calling for abatement, among which he specified, nearly in the words of Humbert de Romanis, the frauds and wrongdoing of the quæstuarii, and, in the project of reform drawn up by the council, the enforcement of the canon of Vienne is urged, only priests of good reputation being permitted to sell indulgences, and this without preaching or lying. In the very slender measure of reform, however, finally conceded by Martin V. there was no mention of this, and of course there was no improvement.[2] The council of Bâle took no action, though Gilles Charlier, in his answer to the complaints of the Hussites, airily remarked that there was nothing to be said as to the venality and excesses connected with indulgences except that they should be abolished.[3] The promise was easily made, but there was no thought of its performance. In the instructions as to interrogatories to be put in the confessional there is one to bishops as to whether they permit quæstuarii to offer indiscreet and false indulgences, while priests are to be asked whether they allow them to put forward fictitious pardons and spurious relics, and whether they make bargains to share in the proceeds, all of which are mortal sins.[4] This participation of bishop and priest in the unhallowed gains of these unscrupulous knaves had long been the object of remonstrance by zealous reformers, who clearly saw that it lay at the root of the whole

[1] Contin. Guillel. de Nangiaco ann. 1330. The *Spedale del Altopasso* was established in the twelfth century on the Arno, with the speciality of ferrying pilgrims over rivers. Apparently the good brethren served as their own quæstuarii.

[2] P. de Alliaco de Emendatione Ecclesiæ Cap. iv. (Von der Hardt, I. 424).—Decret. Reform. Lib. v. Tit. x. (Ibid. p. 754).—Decreta Martini PP. V. in Synodo Constant. n. xiv. (Harduin. VIII. 883).

[3] Harduin. VIII. 1793.

[4] S. Antonini Confessionale fol. 66*b*.—Bart. de Chaimis Interrogator. fol. 93*a*.

trouble.[1] It was, perhaps, through an effort to escape the moral responsibility thus involved that the question was seriously debated whether a man deceived by the lies of a pardoner into purchasing an indulgence really gained or not the indulgence which he expected.[2]

When the progress of the Reformation warned the curia that the time was coming to put its house in order, Paul III., in dread of the general council, so loudly demanded on all sides, submitted to his counsellors for their opinions the questions as to the abuses most bitterly complained of. A report presented to him, probably in 1536, asks why the employment of pardoners should be condemned; if they are disreputable and abuse the faculties granted to them, the episcopal officials have full power to stop their proceedings and to punish their ill-deeds. The only remedy proposed is the futile one suggested by the council of Vienne—that the bishops should have them examined and approve their fitness.[3] The celebrated *Consilium de emendanda Ecclesia*, drawn up for Paul, in 1538, by a commission of cardinals and exalted prelates, was more outspoken. It recommended the abolition of the quæstuarii of the hospitals of Santo Spirito, St. Antony and the like, who deceive the ignorant and teach them innumerable superstitions—but it cautiously refrains from touching on those who labored for the Holy See in vending indulgences for St. Peter's and the crusade.[4] Finally, the council of Trent took the matter energetically in hand, but its action and results can be more conveniently considered hereafter when we come to treat of the counter-Reformation and its consequences.

The reckless dispensation of the treasure of the Church did not wholly escape condemnation by the more thoughtful and unselfish ecclesiastics. Even before the evil had attained its subsequent proportions the great Franciscan preacher, Berthold of Regensburg, constantly inveighed in his sermons against the hawking around of so many papal indulgences.[5] A tract attributed to Gerson, and

[1] Opusc. Tripartit. P. III. Cap. 8 (Fascic. Rer. Expetend. Ed. 1690, II. 227). —Collectio de Scandalis Ecclesiæ (Döllinger, Beiträge zur politischen, Kirchlichen u. Cultur-Geschichte, III. 184).

[2] Steph. ex Nottis Opus Remissionis fol. 157*a*.

[3] Döllinger, *op. cit.* III. 233.

[4] Le Plat, Monumentt. Concil. Trident. II. 603.

[5] Gassari Annales Augstburgens. ann. 1266 (Menkenii Scriptt. R. Germ. I. 1452).

written to prove the necessity of assembling a general council to reform the Church, is excessively bitter on the venality of the curia, which lies to God and man with its indulgences and benedictions and dispensations, calling evil good and good evil. The writer attributes this to Boniface IX., and adds that if it cannot be eradicated the pope and cardinals will appropriate all the wealth of the world, and what they gain by these simonies is lavished on the worst of men to enlarge the temporal dominion of the Roman Church.[1] When the council had failed to provide for the desired reform the concordats framed between the Holy See and England and Germany show how oppressive and injurious the system was felt to be by Christendom. The English document is especially outspoken; men are led into greater audacity of sinning; churches which enjoy indulgences are frequented to the impoverishment of others, which are thus deprived of the oblations of their parishioners, wherefore the bishops are authorized to investigate all indulgences, with power to suspend those which are scandalous and report them to the pope for revocation.[2] Gerson, in 1427, urged those who granted indulgences to be more moderate, so as not to derogate from divine justice and create scandal for the weak.[3] Other writers endeavored to abate the evil by insisting on rigorous rules as conditions for winning these remissions of sin; if forgotten sins are to be included the conscience must be repeatedly searched and the penitent must return to his confessor several times, while to gain a plenary there should be a full and general confession of all sins since infancy.[4] Indeed, about the middle of the fifteenth century there seems to have been a strong reactionary tendency against the whole system. Dionysius Rickel, Johannes Major, and other authorities of the period show a disposition to call in question the value of indulgences, to dwell on their evil influence and to insist more strongly upon the necessity of the penitent earning for himself a claim for pardon.[5] Cardinal Matthew of Krokow denounces the sale of indulgences as a sale of

[1] Jo. Gersonis de Reform. Eccles. Cap. xxv. xxvii. (Von der Hardt, I. v. 129–30, 134).

[2] C. Constantiens. Sess. XLIII. Concord. Anglican. Cap. 2; Concord. German. Cap. 10 (Harduin. VIII. 893).

[3] Jo. Gersonis Opusc. de Indulgent. Consid. XII.

[4] Weigel Claviculæ Indulgent. Cap. 14, 15.

[5] Amort de Indulgent. II. 93–4, 114–15, 118, 126.

the blood of Christ.[1] In 1457 Martin Meyer, writing to Æneas Sylvius to congratulate him on his elevation to the cardinalate, takes occasion to complain of the papal exactions which have reduced Germany from affluence to poverty, and among them he includes the constant issue of new indulgences with the sole object of scraping money together, and the new cardinal can only in reply express his wonder that objection should be made, seeing that the proceeds are entrusted to the pope for distribution; in fact, he adds, it is all merely a question of money, and this has always existed, because men are greedy and insatiable.[2] The abuse continued to be felt, and in 1511 it formed one of the grievances of the German nation against the papacy, drawn up by order of Maximilian I.[3] Of course complaints grew louder after Luther had raised the standard of revolt. The orator who replied to the papal legate at the Diet of Augsburg, in 1518, bewailed the fact that Germany, in constantly admitting indulgences, was exchanging gold for lead, and he even ventured to allude to the story in circulation that the money raised was not really spent on St. Peter's, but that the marble ostensibly carved for it by day was secretly at night conveyed to Florence to construct the Medicean palace.[4] With the progress of the quarrel all reticence was cast aside, and in the list of a hundred grievances drawn up by the Assembly of Nürnberg, in 1523, and sent to Adrian VI. the scandals and oppression connected with the sale of indulgences were treated with a candid vigor that could scarce be exceeded by Luther himself.[5] This, however, belongs to a period beyond our present scope, and will be alluded to more fully hereafter.

---

[1] Matt. de Cracovia de Squaloribus Rom. Curiæ (Fascic. Rer. Expetend. II. 603).

[2] Goldast. Politica Imperialia, p. 1039.—Æneæ Sylvii Epistt. 338, 345, 369.

[3] Gravamina German. Nationis n. viii. (Freher. et Struv. Rer. Germ. Scriptt. II. 677) "Indulgentiæ novæ cum revocatione aut suspensione veterum (laicis contra clerum murmurantibus) ad corradendas pecunias conceduntur."

[4] Op. cit. pp. 702–3—"Laurentius ædificat, non Petrus. Lapides noctu migrant." The story is told more at length by Paul Lang, Chron. Citizens. ann. 1513 (Pistorii Rer. Germ. Scriptt. I. 1280). The authorship of the Augsburg oration has been commonly attributed to Ulric Hutten.

[5] Gravamina Centum, Cap. III. IV. (Le Plat, Monumentt. Conc. Trident. II. 165–6).

CHAPTER VI.

APPLICATION TO THE DEAD.

Not the least of the causes which stimulated the development of indulgences towards the close of the mediæval period was the discovery that they could be used to relieve the souls of the departed in purgatory. This, which speedily became one of the leading objects of the dispensation of the treasure, requires for its proper comprehension a brief review of the gradual evolution of the belief in purgatory as a sojourn where the spirits of those who die in a state of grace pay in torment the debt due for venial sins and for the mortals of which the guilt has been absolved in the sacrament of penitence, without the performance of sufficient satisfaction.

The primitive eschatology which provided only the alternatives of heaven and hell, both eternal in duration, could scarce fail to raise doubts and questions as to the fate of those whose imperfections seemed not to merit the reward of the endless joys promised to the saints, and yet for whom the never-ending torments of hell were a doom too merciless to be ascribed to a just and benignant Father. The predestinarianism of St. Paul rendered speculation on this point superfluous, but as men trained in the culture of the age began to build up a body of theology they could scarce avoid considering the subject, to which, despite its tremendous importance, they could find no word of guidance in gospel and epistle.[1] The problem moreover

[1] The chief texts in which the necessities of Catholic exegesis have sought to find a reference to purgatory have plainly no bearing on the matter. They are—

"But he that shall speak against the Holy Ghost it shall not be forgiven him, neither in this world nor in the world to come" (Matt. xii. 32)—the force of which is weakened by the corresponding passages in Luke (xii. 10) and Mark (iii. 29), where there is no allusion to the world to come. The argument derived from it is that it infers that there are sins which may be pardoned in the future life, and therefore that there must be a purgatory—a wholly irrelevant deduction, incompatible with the accepted doctrine that no mortal sin can be pardoned after death.

was seriously complicated by the acceptance of the doctrine of the resurrection and day of judgment, derived from Mazdeism through Judaism, under which the destiny of the soul is not to be determined until the Second Advent. It was impossible to reconcile this with the parable of Dives and Lazarus, with the words of Christ to the penitent thief, "This day thou shalt be with me in Paradise" (Luke XXIII. 43), and with the desire expressed by St. Paul to be dissolved and to be with Christ (Philipp. I. 23). We shall presently see the devices finally adopted to elude the incompatibility.[1]

As there was nothing in scripture to teach an intermediate state between heaven and hell, where souls not damned might be prepared

---

"Amen, I say to thee thou shalt not go from thence till thou repay the last farthing" (Matt. v. 26).

"For other foundation no man can lay but that which is laid; which is Christ Jesus.

"Now if any man build upon this foundation, gold, silver, precious stones, wood, hay, stubble:

"Every man's work shall be manifest; for the day of the Lord shall declare it, because it shall be revealed in fire; and the fire shall try every man's work, of what sort it is.

"If any man's work abide, which he hath built thereupon, he shall receive a reward.

"If any man's work burn he shall suffer loss; but he himself shall be saved, yet so as by fire." (I. Cor. III. 11–15.)

If these somewhat enigmatical utterances are intended to refer to the future life, the Fathers who, as we shall see, deduced from them that punishment is not to be eternal, were fairly justified. When the question of purgatory was debated between the Latins and Greeks at the council of Florence, in 1438, the passage, I. Cor. III. 11–15, was the only one cited by the former in support of their doctrine.—Bzovii Annal. ann. 1438, No. 25.

More ingenious than convincing is the argument of Werstemius against Luther, that the apostles did not specifically refer to purgatory, because it was so universally recognized that no allusion to it was necessary.—Joan. Werstemii adversus Lutheranæ Sectæ Renatum quemdam de Purgatorio Disputatio (s. l. e. a. sed Colon. 1528).

[1] The Jews were exposed to the same difficulty. See the four conflicting theories enumerated by Maimonides, Comment. in Mishnam, Sanhedrin, xi. 1. See also Abarbanel's "Fourteen Roots," in his introduction to Isaiah, printed with illustrative notes by Pococke. Cf. II. Esdras vii. 26–35.

For the Mazdean conception of the resurrection and judgment at the coming of the Messiah Saoshyans, see Zamyad-Yasht, 11, 19, 89 (Avesta, Traduit par C. de Harlez, III. 77, 78, 88–9).—Diog. Laertii Vit. Philosoph. Procem. 9. —Bundehesh Cap. XXXI. (Uebersetzt von Justi, pp. 40–43).

for eternal bliss, the earlier Fathers, for the most part, had no conception of such a provision, and indeed the constant expectation of the Second Advent as momentarily impending seemed to render such speculations superfluous. As a rule, they do not waste much time on eschatological doctrines; they know of heaven and hell and the resurrection, but of nothing else.[1] It is the same with the creeds. That of Hippolytus alludes to the day of judgment, but not to any provision for preparing souls to meet it, and the gradually developing symbols which were evolved from it show an equal absence of any belief in a doctrine which has since become so prominent an article of faith.[2] Perhaps the most authoritative utterance in the third century is the letter to Cyprian from the Roman church, in 250, during the interregnum between Fabianus and Cornelius, in which God is said to have prepared heaven and hell, and no allusion is made to any intermediate condition, a reference to which would have been unavoidable had there existed a conception of such a place.[3] Cyprian himself shows how vague and unsettled were as yet the beliefs as to all details beyond this; he tells us that there is no place for repentance hereafter; the destiny of the soul is decided here; the end of the world is at hand; but he ignores the delay till the day of judgment when he comforts his flock during a pestilence by assuring them that their dear ones are awaiting them in paradise in the company of the prophets, apostles and martyrs, and again he assumes that those who die unreconciled go at once to hell, while

[1] Clement. Epist. I. ad Corinth. XI. 16–20.—Justini Martyris Apol. II.—Tatiani, contra Græcos Orat.—Doctrine of Addai the Apostle, Philipps's Transl. p. 45 (London, 1876).—Tertull. de Pœnit Cap. xii.—Ps. Clement. Epist. II. ad Corinth. II. 16.—Athenag. de Resurrect. Mortuorum.—Minucii Felicis Octavius. —Clement. Recognit. Lib I. Cap. 24, 49, 51.

[2] Canon. Hippol. XIX. 122; XXXVIII. 257 (Achelis, pp. 96–7, 136). So in the Symbol of the Apostles we have the resurrection and the coming of Christ to judge the quick and the dead, but nothing about an intermediate state. In the Tridentine Confession of Faith, however, purgatory is introduced "Constanter teneo Purgatorium esse, animasque ibi detentas fidelium suffragiis juvari."—Pii PP. IV. Bull. *Injunctum Nobis*, 13 Nov. 1564.

[3] Cypriani Epist. XXX. (Ed. Oxon.) "Deus . . . paravit cœlum sed paravit et tartarum. Paravit refrigeria sed paravit etiam æterna supplicia. Paravit inaccessibilem lucem sed paravit etiam perpetuæ noctis vastam æternamque caliginem."

those who die in the Church will be judged by God when he comes.[1]

In the apocalyptic and apocryphal writings, so numerous in the earlier centuries, which, though not canonical, unquestionably represent the ideas current among Christians to explain what was left uncertain in Holy Writ, there is no conception of a condition intermediate between heaven and hell. The soul is judged as soon as it leaves the body; the references to the resurrection are merely such as are necessary to keep in line with dogma; if the soul is found to be righteous, which rarely occurs, it is admitted at once to bliss; if wicked, it is delivered to the avenging angel Tartaruch, and is carried to eternal punishment. There are disputes between good and evil angels over doubtful cases, resulting in salvation or damnation as may happen; in the Syriac version of the Apocalypse of Paul there is an attempt to explain the salvation of the partially good by the assertion that, if a righteous man sins, God sends him punishment in retribution during life. Purification *post-mortem* evidently as yet formed no part of belief, unless we accept as such an intimation in the Testament of Isaac that the punishment of sinners is not eternal, but endures only "until the God of mercy be merciful and have mercy on them."[2]

The question as to whether judgment is immediate or postponed till the resurrection was a puzzling one. St. John had said (v. 28–29) that the dead rest in their graves till the Lord comes, when the good shall arise to life and the wicked to judgment, but this did not meet with universal acceptance. A tract which passes under the name of Justin Martyr, but which belongs to the third or fourth century, declares that at death the good are at once conducted to paradise, where they enjoy the Beatific Vision, while the evil are thrust into hell to await the resurrection and judgment; during the

---

[1] Cypriani Epist. ad Demetrianum *ad calcem;* De Mortalitate *ad calcem;* Epist. LV. ad Autonianum. A passage in the latter epistle has been adduced to prove that Cyprian believed in the future purgation of sinners by fire, but in view of his other utterances it can only be regarded as a figure of rhetoric.

[2] The Testament of Abraham, by M. R. James (Cambridge, 1892).—The Revelation of Paul (Clark's Ante-Nicene Library, Vol. XVI. pp. 480–3).—Jude, I. 9.—Origenis Homil. XXXV. in Lucam.

interval the soul has consciousness but not the bodily senses.[1] Lactantius, on the other hand, postpones the judgment till the last day, at least for Christians; if their good works prevail they are then admitted to bliss; if the evil preponderates they are condemned to torment: but those who know not God are already condemned and are not resurrected (John III. 18).[2] In either case, it will be seen, the idea of a place or term of purgation is excluded. The question as to immediate judgment or postponement until the resurrection refused to be settled. St. Hilary of Poitiers assumes that the punishment of the impious commences at once, while the glory of the blest is postponed till the resurrection, and at that time sinners will be judged.[3] St. Optatus assumes that at the day of judgment Christ will determine who are his children and who are not.[4] St. Zeno, on the other hand, assures us that at death the soul is assigned to a place of rest or of punishment where it awaits the resurrection, when the saints will arise to heaven and the sinners and heathen to hell.[5] Chrysostom holds that at once the righteous go to Christ and the wicked to torment, and that there is no place for repenting and washing away our sins after death.[6] The Sibylline Books consign all souls to Hades, a place of darkness and silence where they await the day of judgment, the righteous encouraged with the hopes of heaven, and the wicked tormented with the anticipations of eternal fire.[7] There is no provision for the purification of the intermediate class.

Yet it was impossible that all minds should assent to this arbitrary division into the elect and the reprobate, and some middle term was naturally sought which should reconcile divine justice and mercy with the infinite gradations of human imperfection. As early as the second century St. Irenæus suggests that after the resurrection the righteous will dwell on earth, in paradise or in heaven, according to

[1] Ps. Just. Mart. Explicationes Quæstt. a Gentt. Christianis positar. Q. 2, 3, 60, 75, 76, 77, 109, 120.

[2] Lactant. Divin. Institt. Lib. VII. Cap. xi., xx., xxiii.

[3] Hilarii Pictaviens. Tract. in Ps. I. n. 17–19; in LVII. n. 5; Comment. in Matth. Cap. 5.

[4] S. Optati de Schismate Donatist. Lib. VII. Cap. ii.

[5] S. Zenonis Veronens. Tractatus. Lib. I. Tract. XVI. n. 2, 11.

[6] S. Jo. Chrysost. in Epist. ad Philippens. Homil. III. n. 3, 4; De Lazaro Concio II. n. 3.

[7] Alexandre, Excursus ad Sibyllina, Exc. VI. Cap. xxi. (Parisiis, 1856).

their several deserts, and there is an obscure intimation of some preliminary discipline which shall prepare man for incorruption.[1] It was quite natural that such conceptions should be formed, for among the pagans there was belief in a future life in which the wicked are tormented in a purgatorial process, gradually purging the sins which have not been punished on earth.[2] The Shepherd of Hermas speaks of purification by torment after death of those who have not justified themselves in life, when their degree of repentance will determine whether the punishment is temporary or eternal.[3] Origen's speculations were not wholly consistent. In one passage he tells us that at the day of judgment every one will be sent to a place fitted for his merits and demerits; elsewhere he asserts that no man is perfectly pure, even Peter and Paul require purification after death. God will sit in judgment and purge all souls with fire; the lead will be burnt away and the pure gold remain, but the more the lead the longer will be the process, while he who is all lead will be plunged into the abyss as lead into the sea.[4] St. Hilary of Poitiers to some

---

[1] Irenæi contra Hæres. Lib. v. Cap. 35, 36.

[2] Plutarchi de Sera Numina Vindict. XXII.—Virgilii Æneidos VI. 738–47. See also the Commentary of Servius on this passage.

[3] Hermæ Pastor. Lib. I. Vis. iii.

[4] Origenis περὶ Ἀρχῶν Lib. II. Cap. ix. §§ 6–8; In Numeros Homil. XXV. § 6; In Ps. XXXVI. Homil III. § 1; In Exodum Homil. VI. Cap. 4.

Those who are resurrected to eternal fire will be clothed in an incorruptible body capable of enduring it forever, but this fire is supplied by each for himself out of his own sins; it is the consciousness of his sins and the fury of his passions that will torment him.—Περὶ Ἀρχῶν Lib. II. Cap. ix. § 3.

This was a heresy combated by St. Jerome (Epist. CXXIV. § 7), who likewise accuses Origen (§§ 10–11) of teaching metempsychosis. Origen however expressly denies transmigration (Contra Celsum Lib. IV. § 17), though he asserts that all souls are pre-creations, sent to earth, heaven or hell, according to their deserts in the anterior life (Περὶ Ἀρχῶν, *ubi sup.*). See also Hieron. Epistt. LXXXV. § 5; XCVI. §§ 7, 8; XCVIII. §§ 10, 11.

The orthodox doctrine of the resurrection was not adopted without considerable opposition. It was not only heresiarchs such as Marcus, Hieraca and Seleucus that denied it (S. Augustin. de Hæresibus, XIV. XLVII. LIX.), but, if Celsus is to be believed, many Christians rejected it (Origenis contra Celsum Lib. V. § 14). During the fourth century we find Hilary of Poitiers (Comment. in Matth. Cap. 5), St. Ambrose (de Excessu Fratris Lib. II. §§ 48–108) and St. Jerome (contra Joannem Hierosol. Cap. 31; contra Rufinum Lib. II. Cap. 5) busy in defending it, and even at the close of the sixth century Gregory the Great tells us not only that many disbelieved it, but that he himself had done so formerly (Homil. in Evangelia, Homil. XXVI. § 12).

extent followed Origen; after the day of judgment there will be a purgatorial fire to burn away our sins—doubtless proportioned to their gravity.[1] St. Ambrose sought to solve the problem by a theory which assimilates him to the Chiliasts. He quotes the Apocalypse (xx. 6) "Blessed and holy is he that hath part in the first resurrection," and says that these come to grace without judgment, while those who are reserved for the second resurrection will burn throughout the interval between the two, and then, if they shall not have fulfilled their punishment they will be kept still longer in torment.[2] St. Jerome is not wholly consistent in his utterances. He mentions, without condemning, a current belief that after death there will come a personal struggle with Satan, fiercer than in life; he tells us that there is no opportunity for repentance hereafter—the tree lies as it falls—but, when balancing between those who held future punishment to be temporary and those who regarded it as eternal, he inclines to the belief that the devil and the impious who deny God will suffer for ever, while wicked Christians will all have their sins purged by fire and find the sentence of the judge to be merciful[3]—a conception not very far removed from the speculations of Origen. Rufinus seems to know no alternative between endless bliss and bale.[4]

Thus far there had been no definite acceptance of the idea of purga-

[1] S. Hilarii Pictaviens Tract. in Ps. CXVIII. n. 5, 12.

[2] S. Ambros. in Ps. I. Enarrat. § 54. Cf. §§ 51–3, 56; De Spiritu Sancto Lib. I. § 170; De Fide Lib. V. Cap. xvii.

For the Chiliasts or Millenarians see Epiphan. Panar. Hæres. LXXVII.

This first resurrection was a matter not easily explained. Hippolytus of Porto (De Christo et Antichristo § 65) accepts it without expounding it. St. Augustin (De Civitate Dei Lib. XX. Cap. 6) places the first resurrection in the present life, when the sinner becomes converted and reforms; no one can share in the glories of the final resurrection who has not experienced the first. In this he is followed by St. Fulgentius of Ruspe (De Remiss. Peccator. Lib. II. Cap. xii.) and St. Eloi of Noyon (Homil. VIII.), while the Venerable Bede (Explanat. Apocalyps. Lib. III. Cap. xx.) explains that the first resurrection is baptism. This however was not the accepted doctrine, for some liturgies of the period, in the prayers for the dead, ask that the soul may be admitted to the first resurrection.—Missale Gothicum (Muratori T. XIII. P. III. pp. 305, 417, 432); Sacrament. Gallican. (Ibid. pp. 895, 896).

For the various attempts to solve the enigma see Patuzzi, *De futuro Impiorum Statu*, pp. 301 sqq.

[3] S. Hieron. Comment. in Epist. ad Ephes. Lib. II. Cap. vi. v. 13; Super Ecclesiast. 11; Comment. in Isaiam Lib. XVII. Cap. lxvi.

[4] Rufini Comment. in Symbol. Apostolor. n. 43.

tory, a place or condition of temporary punishment, intermediate between heaven and hell, destined for those not good enough for the former and too good for the latter. Speculation however had been tending in that direction, and it received a decided impulse from St. Augustin, who, in his repeated discussions of everything connected with faith and morals, was necessarily forced to treat of eschatology from every point of view. He is the authority most frequently and confidently quoted in support of the antiquity of the modern doctrine of purgatory, but his views with respect to it were by no means consistent or decided. In an extended discussion on the future life he asserts positively that there are but two places for the soul after death—the Kingdom of God and damnation with Satan.[1] Yet the interval between death and the day of judgment seemed to require some provision for disembodied spirits. To supply this, like St. Zeno of Verona, he tells us that they are received into various hidden receptacles, where the good enjoy rest and joy, the wicked suffer torment, until the resurrection, when the joy of the one and the torment of the other will be increased by reincarnation.[2] In this there

[1] S. August. Serm. CCXCIV. Cap. iii.

[2] S. August. Enchirid. Cap. cix.; In Joannis Evangel. Tract. XLIX. § 10.

While thus providing these temporary receptacles, St. Augustin, in combating the Pelagians, positively denies that there is a separate place for the souls of unbaptized children—the *Limbus Parvulorum* or *Puerorum* of the schoolmen (Serm. CCXCIV. Cap. iii.); the most that he will allow is that for them the pains of hell will be greatly lessened (Enchirid. Cap. xciii.). When the schoolmen undertook to perfect the details of eschatology they recognized the necessity of such a place, as well as a limbo for the fathers prior to the Atonement. William of Paris argues (Opera de Fide etc. Norimbergæ 1496, fol. 206*a*) that there must be manifestly such a place for those guilty only of original sin; they cannot go either to purgatory or to the *Limbus Patrum*, for they are not worthy of it, and he concludes that they enjoy great happiness, though not comparable to that of the Divine Vision. Aquinas holds that the *Limbus Puerorum* and *Limbus Patrum* are the same place, but that the holy fathers enjoy a more blessed rest than the children (Summæ Supplem. Q. LXIX. Art. 6), and this is not hell (Art. 7). Dante (Inferno III.) describes only one limbo, and assigns it to the first circle of hell. It is not a place of torment, but of sighs and sorrow—

> Non avea pianto, ma che di sospiri,
> Che l'aura eterna facevan tremare:
> E cio avvenia di duol senza martiri,
> Ch' avean le turbe, ch'eran molti e grandi
> D'infanti e di femmine e viri.

is no trace of purgation by fire, through which the soul is purified and fitted for heaven, but elsewhere he hazards the opinion that such purgation is not incredible, but is fairly debatable.[1] In some passages he relegates this to the day of judgment, while in others he regards it as antecedent, and again he thinks it perhaps true that venial sins may be thus expiated,[2] but there is no such hope for those who have learned the Christian faith and have lived wickedly.[3]

Whatever weight St. Augustin may have ascribed to these crude and tentative speculations they seem to have awakened no response. Among his later contemporaries Zacchæus denies that souls are purged with ethereal fire before rejoining their Creator, and Evagrius the Monk knows of no middle term between salvation and damnation.[4] A little later St. Salvianus argues that every man's fate is in his own hands, and that according to his acts will the divine judgment award him endless torment or eternal bliss.[5] St. Leo I., in 452, evidently knew nothing of a purgatory accessible to the suffrages of the living when he asserted that a penitent who dies before the completion of his penance cannot be reconciled because God has

Good pagans, prior to Christ, are there—Virgil himself, Homer, Brutus etc. After the crucifixion Christ descended there and withdrew Adam, Moses, Abraham and the rest of the fathers. François de Mayrone (In IV. Sentt. Dist. xx. Q. iv.) divides the limbos, and says that that of the fathers was emptied when the law of grace began. In 1575, in an authoritative profession of faith, drawn up by Gregory XIII. for acceptance by the Greeks, the *Limbus Puerorum* disappears; all who die in mortal sin and all who have only original sin descend together to hell, but are punished differently (Gregor. PP. XIII. Const. XXXIII. § 4.—Bullar. II. 429). Yet when, in 1786, the Synod of Pistoia (Sess. IV. Decr. del Battesimo § 3) followed St. Augustin in denying as a Pelagian fable the existence of a separate place for unbaptized children, Pius VII. condemned the utterance as false, rash and insulting to Catholic teaching (Bull. *Auctorem fidei* Prop. XXVI.).

[1] S. Augustin. Enchirid. Cap. lxix. "Tale aliquid etiam post hanc vitam fieri incredibile non est, et utrum ita sit quæri potest." See also *De Fide et Operibus* Cap. xvi.; *De Octo Dulcitii Quæstionibus* Q. I. § 13.

[2] S. August. de Civitate Dei Lib. XX. Cap. XXV.; Lib. XXI. Cap. xiii. xxiv. xxvi.—Yet venial sins are wiped out by daily recital of the Lord's Prayer, and those who have nothing else go to blessed rest (Serm. CCCXCIII.).

[3] S. August. de Fide et Operibus Cap. XXV.

[4] Zacchæi Consultationum Lib. I. Cap. xxii.-xxiii.—Evagrii Monachi Sententiæ, I.

[5] S. Salviani adv. Avaritiam Lib. III. Cap. 3.

reserved him for his own judgment,[1] while the pseudo-Dionysiac speculations, about this period, teach a course of purgation through which the soul gradually fits itself for absorption in the Divine Essence.[2] In the following century St. Fulgentius of Ruspe argues at much length to prove that there can be no remission of sin after death—it is a time of retribution, not of remission, and the false hope of this held out by the devil leads many to hell.[3] As the distinction between *culpa* and *pœna* had not yet been invented, this excludes all idea of purgatorial expiation. Victor of Tunones, in his vivid description of heaven and hell, knows of no intermediate state and no alternative, and it is the same with St. Dorotheus.[4]

Yet undoubtedly the belief in some kind of *post-mortem* purgation must have gradually spread, not as a point of faith, but as an admissible pious belief. Towards the close of the sixth century a passing allusion occurs to it by Gregory of Tours.[5] In 593 Gregory the Great in his Dialogues makes his interlocutor ask to be instructed whether it is to be believed that there is a fire of purgation after death, to which Gregory's answer is affirmative, but he limits it to trifling sins, such as idle talk, immoderate laughter and the like,

[1] S. Leonis PP. I. Epist. CVIII. Cap. iii.

Yet in the Sacramentary which passes under the name of Leo there is a prayer antagonistic to this utterance—"Omnipotens sempiterne Deus, qui contulisti fidelibus tuis remedia vitæ post mortem, præsta quæsumus propitius ac placatus, ut anima famuli tui (illius) a peccatis omnibus expiata in tuæ redemptionis sorte requiescat."—Sacram. Leonian. *Super Defunctos*, I. (Muratori T. XIII. P. I. p. 730).

A subsequent prayer even assumes that the soul of the dead can be cleansed of sin by the sacrifice offered for it—"Ut quidquid terrena conversatione contraxit his sacrificiis emundetur."

[2] Book of Hierotheos, Bk. III. (Frothingham, Stephen Bar Sudaili, pp. 100–1, Leipzig, 1895).—Cf. S. Dionysii Cœlestis Hierarchiæ Lib. I. Cap. xiii.

In another passage (Eccles. Hierarchiæ Cap. vii.) the pseudo-Dionysius represents the high priest as praying over the dead that God may pardon their sins. This gave extreme comfort to the controversialists against Luther. Joh. Werstemius (Adversus Lutheranæ Sectæ Renatum quemdam de Purgatorio, Colon. 1528) pronounces it as sufficient in itself to prove the existence of purgatory.

[3] S. Fulgent. Ruspens. de Remiss. Peccator. Lib. I. Cap. vi. ix. xxiv.; Lib. II. Cap. vi.

[4] Victor Tununens. Lib. de Pœnitent. Cap. xxx. xxxi.—S. Dorothæi Archimandritæ Doctrina XII. De Timore et Pœnis Inferni.

[5] Gregor. Turonens. de Gloria Martyrum Lib. II. Cap. cvii.

which are inseparable from human infirmity. How crude as yet were the conceptions of such temporary punishment is seen in his stories of slaves working in baths, who were spirits condemned thus to expiate their sins. One of these was Paschasius, a deacon of the Roman Church and a man of most exemplary life, who made the mistake of adhering to Laurence in the strife between him and Symmachus for the papacy in 498, and another was the lord of Civita Vecchia.[1] Naturally the growing belief was stimulated with the customary arts of forgery. A letter was fabricated from Cyril, Bishop of Jerusalem, to St. Augustin, relating how a powerful sect of heretics sprang up who denied the existence of purgatory until the dead St. Jerome appeared in a vision to the holy priest Eusebius and told him to reanimate three dead men whom St. Jerome had providently carried to heaven, hell, and purgatory, and who therefore were able to give full and accurate descriptions of the three abodes.[2] In the seventh century St. Eloi of Noyon has no doubt of the existence of purgatorial fire, based on the text I. Cor. III. 13, but his exegesis is literal. It is a test through which every soul must pass; the wicked will go through it into hell, the just will overcome it, and if they have venial sins these will be burnt out: it will last until the day of judgment, when every one will be saved

[1] Gregor. PP. I. Dial. Lib. IV. Cap. xxxix. xl. lv.

It was long before this idea of localized purgatory, by which spirits in the shape of men expiated their sins on earth, was abandoned. Hugh of S. Victor (De Sacramentis Lib. II. P. xvi. Cap. 4) says that many revelations and examples show that purgatory is on earth, and it is probable that the punishment is inflicted where the sins were committed. St. Bonaventura (In IV. Sentt. Dist. XX. P. 1, Art. 2, Q. 3) alludes to this belief as held by some, but he regards it as improbable. Aquinas, however (Summa Suppl. Q. LXIX. Art. vii. ad 8) says that it occasionally occurs, though the real place of purgatory is elsewhere. Even in the fifteenth century Gerson (Serm. II. Pro Defunctis), on the authority of Gregory, says that it is sometimes on earth, but its regular place is near the *Limbus Patrum*.

D'Achery prints (Spicileg. I. 225) a tract, *De Ordine Creaturarum*, attributed to St. Isidor of Seville (died 636), in which Cap. xiv. is devoted to the purgatorial fire. This is described as exceeding in severity all that human imagination can conceive, and though it is restricted to trifling sins, the whole has an air of assured positiveness which convinces me that it must be posterior in date.

[2] Ps. Augustin. Epist. XIX. (Migne, XXXIII. 1126).

or damned.[1] This theory, however, seems to have had little currency, and Gregory's conception of a purgatorial fire which cleansed the soul of trifling sins was elaborated in a sermon, which long passed under the name of St. Augustin, and which was apparently composed about this time. It probably had considerable influence in establishing the doctrine and perfecting the details. Many deceive themselves, it says, with the belief that mortal sins will be purged with temporary fire, but this is a mistake; it is only the trifling ones that will be thus burnt away, and that no one may be in doubt as to the difference it gives quite an elaborate list of mortals and venials; some make light of the purgatorial fire, but its intensity is beyond human conception, and the moral is drawn that both classes of sins should be assiduously redeemed during life, while there is no hint that after death there can be any assistance rendered to the soul, and of course no allusion to a *pœna* remaining for mortal sins after absolution.[2] About this time also in a Gallican liturgy we begin to find traces of a rudimentary conception of expiatory punishment after death,[3] but in the Gelasian and Gregorian Sacramentaries there is no allusion to any alternative save bliss or condemnation.[4] In fact, the subject seems to have attracted very little attention. The Venerable Bede, in commenting on the text of Matthew XII. 32, merely says that it shows that some sins, such as idle words and superfluous thoughts will be forgiven in the next world, without any

[1] S. Eligii Noviomens. Homil. VIII. St. Augustin (De Fide et Operibus Cap. XV. XVI.) alludes to a somewhat similar belief as current in his time, but he condemns it.

There is some similarity between this test and the Bridge Chinvat of the Mazdean eschatology, which only the just could cross, while the wicked were plunged into hell. See Vendidad, Fargard XIX. 96–108; Arda-Viraf, IV. XVII. In the completed myth it is called Chandor, and, like the corresponding Islamitic bridge Sirat, it is as narrow as a hair and as sharp as a razor for the wicked, while for the just it is broad and easy.—Minokhired II. 114–91; Dabistan I. 285.

[2] Ps. August. Serm. CIV. Append. (Migne, XXXIX. 1946). In the old classification it is Serm. XLI. de Sanctis. It is also given by Gratian, post cap. 3 Dist. XXV.

[3] Sacram. Gallican. (Muratori, T. XIII. P. III. pp. 729, 897–8).—"Ut eisdem, Dominus, adtenuatis quæ merito aspera sunt culpæ piaculis, clementissime remissionis suæ refrigeria largiatur."

[4] Sacram. Gelasian. Lib. III. n. XCI.–CVI. (Muratori, T. XIII. P. II. pp. 415–42).—Sacrament. Gregorian. (Ibid. pp. 834, 837–57).

allusion to purgatorial torment, and a tract ascribed to Bede, in treating of future rewards and punishments, knows nothing of any temporary purgation.[1] On the other hand, a vision related by St. Boniface shows the existence of a belief that some souls may lie in torment till the day of judgment and then be admitted to bliss.[2] In the Carlovingian revival this takes a more definite shape. Alcuin tells us that those who are to be saved at the last day will feel this fire in proportion to the degree of their sin; to the perfect it will be as the Babylonian furnace to the three children, and at the resurrection the saints and the impious will be divided.[3] Yet some theologians of the ninth century in treating of cognate matters pass it over in silence,[4] while others have a more or less crude conception of it. Rabanus Maurus, in one passage, says that there will be purgation for trifling sins if merited by good works during life, and in another he copies St. Augustin in thinking it not incredible and a fair subject of inquiry whether there may be some testing by fire in the future life.[5] Walafrid Strabo states that the fire which will consume the world at the judgment day will last until those who are to be saved are purged.[6] Thus far it is observable that this purgatorial fire is to continue till the resurrection, and this is the view of Haymo of Halberstadt, who treats the subject more in detail than any of his predecessors. He is rather argumentative and inconsistent; he limits it as usual to the trifling sins inseparable from human life, but he finally concludes with St. Augustin that between death and the day of judgment souls are placed in hidden receptacles of rest or suffering as they have merited, but he adds the highly important corollary that this period of torment may be shortened by the prayers and lamentations of the survivors, their alms-

[1] Bedæ in Matth. Exposit. Lib. II. Cap. xii.—Ps. Bedæ aliquot Quæstionum Liber, Q. x.–xii. (Migne, XCIII. 464–5). Bede relates (Hist. Eccles. Lib. v. Cap. xix.) the vision of the holy Furseus, who was carried by angels to the other world. Four centuries later we should have had a detailed account of purgatory, but here there is no word about it.

[2] S. Bonifacii Epist. XX. ad Eadburgam.

[3] Alcuini de Fide Lib. III. Cap. xxi.

[4] Druthmari Corbeiens. Exposit. in Matthæum Cap. xxxiv.—Ps. Alcuini de Divinis Officiis Lib. III. Cap. 50.

[5] Rabani Mauri Comment. in Matthæum Lib. IV. Cap. xii.; Enarrat. in Epp. Pauli Lib. IX. Cap. iii.

[6] Wal. Strabi Glossa Ordinaria in Epist. I. ad Corinth. III. 13.

giving and causing masses to be celebrated[1]—the earliest indication I have met of the direct application of the doctrine of purgatorial fires to stimulate the liberality of mourners. In spite of this recognition of the productiveness of the belief it does not appear as yet to have attained sufficient importance to be alluded to in the progress of the Greek schism, although purgatory has been wholly confined to the Western Church and never has been accepted in the East. In 859 Photius does not include it in his confession of faith; in 866 Nicholas I. does not allude to it in his detailed reply to the Bulgarians, who were proposing to submit to Rome; in 868 Æneas of Paris makes no mention of it in his elaborate discussion of the differences between the Churches, and in 869 the canons and anathemas of the council of Constantinople are silent respecting it.[2] It evidently was too uncertain or too trivial a question to be ranked with the procession of the Holy Ghost, clerical celibacy, the character of the Lenten fast, shaving the beard, image worship, and the supremacy of the Bishop of Rome.

In the tenth century there is little to be learned on the subject, which had apparently not grown in importance. Odo of Cluny, in discussing the wicked, the good and the imperfect, seems to know nothing save heaven and hell, but the belief undoubtedly was spreading among the people and taking a wider scope, for Ratherius of Verona warns his flock not to delude themselves in expectation of it, for it is reserved only for trifling sins, and, in 1025, Gerard of Cambrai quotes Gregory I. to the same effect.[3] It is not till we reach the middle of the eleventh century that we find in St. Peter Damiani the modern conception of purgatory, when he says that those who live as though the body were a prison go to heaven, those who persevere in sin until the end go to hell, while those who commit mortal sin, but repent before death, are sent to purgatory, where they are duly punished.[4] This view did not immediately prevail.

---

[1] Haymon. Halberstat. de Varietate Librorum Lib. III. Cap. i.–ix.

[2] Baron. Annal. ann. 859 n. 64–8.—Nicholai PP. I. Epist. xcvii.—Æneæ Paris. Episc. adv. Græcos (D'Achery Spicileg. I. 113).—C. Constantinop. ann. 869, Act. x. (Harduin. V. 899–918).

[3] Odon Cluniac. Collationum Lib. I. n. 37–41.—Ratherii Veronens. Serm. II. n. 22.—Acta Synod. Atrebatens. ann. 1025, Cap. ix. (D'Achery Spicileg. I. 619).

[4] S. Pet. Damian. Serm. LIX. He tells an illustrative story (Epistt. Lib. VI.

About 1100 Anselm of Laon, the foremost theologian of his time and one of the founders of the schools of Paris, recurs to the ideas of Gregory I., saying that purgatory is for trifling sins, and even for these it is to be obtained only by those who have merited it during life. On the other hand, Hildebert of Le Mans inclines to the newer theory; there is a kind of life that is not so chastened but that it requires placation after death, nor so wicked that it does not deserve it. Ivo of Chartres speaks of purgatories in the plural, as though there were several.[1] Yet still the conception of such an intermediate receptacle for departed souls had by no means become universally accepted. In the poetical account of the legend of St. Brandan's wanderings in search of hell and the terrestrial paradise there are full descriptions of the horrors of the one and the delights of the other, but there is no allusion whatever to the existence of purgatory.[2]

With the development of scholastic theology the conceptions of purgatory became firmer and more defined. Hugh of St. Victor says that those who die with some sins, but are just and predestined to eternal life, are tormented for a time and purged, but, as we have seen, he follows Gregory I. in thinking that this is done on earth.[3] The pseudo-Augustin, who did so much to crystallize the current thought in these matters, develops in an assured tone the theory which finally became accepted. Hell is reserved for the impenitent. The sinner who repents, but postpones to the future life the fruits of his repentance, will be purged by the fires of purgation, which are of wondrous intensity, greater than all suffering in life, for there is no torture of the flesh equal to it.[4] By this time the existence of purgatory may be regarded as generally accepted. St. Bernard treats it as a matter of course, though he mingles cold with fire as an

Ep. 20) of a monk who undertook to share the penance of a friend and died before he had completed it. He had no sins of his own to answer for, but was detained in purgatory to expiate those of his friend. He appeared to the latter and begged for a speedy release, when the monks of the convent divided the unfinished penance among them and on its performance he appeared again and announced his translation to glory.

[1] Anselmi Laudunens. Enarrat. in Matthæum Cap. XII.—Hildeberti Cenomanens. Epistt. Lib. I. Epist. xvi.—Ivon. Carnotens. Epist. clxxiv.

[2] Voyages Merveilleux de Saint Brandan. Publiés par Francisque-Michel, Paris, 1878.

[3] Hugon. de S. Victore de Sacram. Lib. II. P. xvi. Cap. 4.

[4] Ps. Augustini de Vera et Falsa Pœnit. Cap. xvii.

element of its torment, and when the Cathari denied that there was such a place he enumerates this among their heresies. His disciples, Nicholas of Clairvaux and Guerric, Abbot of Igny, naturally follow him. The former describes it as destined for those who delay repentance till the approach of death and are unable to complete their penance; the latter enlarges on the intensity of its fires transcending all human conception, and informs us that the elect are few, but of these elect scarce any are so perfect as to escape it.[1] Peter Lombard vacillates

[1] S. Bernardi Serm. de Diversis, Serm. XLII. n. 5; Serm. in Cantica, Serm. LXVI. n. 11.—Nicolai Claræ Vallensis Serm. de S. Nicolao n. 6 (Migne, CLXXXIV. 1058).—Guerrici Abbatis de Purificatione Mariæ Serm. VI. n. 2 (Ibid. CLXXXV. 89).

It is probably to this period that is to be attributed the belief in what was called the purgatory of St. Patrick—a cave on an island in Lough Derg, county Donegal, Ulster. The legend relates that when the Irish were incredulous as to future rewards and punishments, St. Patrick, to convince them, obtained from God a revelation of this place and established a monastery to superintend it. Henry of Saltrey, an Irish monk of the second half of the twelfth century, appears to be the earliest writer to describe it. He gives a long account of the experience of Owen, an Irish knight in the service of King Stephen, who resolved to undergo it in expiation of his sins. As a permit from the bishop of the diocese was necessary, he made full confession to him and obtained the required license. The monks warned him to resist the wiles and threats of the demons whom he would encounter, for many of those who entered were never seen again. The entrance was surrounded by a wall with a locked gate; after introducing a penitent the gate was locked; the next morning it was opened, and if he was not found there it was assumed that he had succumbed to the demons, and it was locked again. In this case Owen gropes his way through the cavern until he comes to a great temple, where fifteen reverend old men instruct him that by invoking the name of Jesus the demons will have no power to harm him. Then come a multitude of evil spirits who threaten him with torments if he persists, and promise to convey him back in safety if he will return. He perseveres, and they carry him through all the regions of hell and endeavor to subject him to the different species of torture in each place, but the name of Christ carries him in safety through all. Then he comes to the terrestrial paradise and surveys its delights, after which he hurries back to be in time for the opening of the gate.—Henrici Salteriensis Tract de Purgat. S. Patricii n. 39-65 (Migne, CLXXX). Matthew Paris (Hist. Angl. ann. 1153) transcribes this account, and Cæsarius of Heisterbach (Dial. Dist. XII. Cap. xxxvii) describes the same conditions.

Giraldus Cambrensis, however (Topog. Hibernicæ Dist. II. Cap. 5), speaks of nine caves, and says that whoever passes a night in one of them is seized by the demons and is so tortured by fire and water that in the morning he is found scarce alive. He adds that it is said that if this is endured as enjoined

between St. Augustin and the pseudo-Augustin and is by no means consistent in his utterances on the subject.[1] His contemporary,

---

penance the penitent will be free from infernal punishment unless he commits fresh sins. Jacques de Vitry (Hist. Hierosol. Lib. I. Cap. xci.) tells us that unless he who enters is truly penitent and contrite he is at once slain by the demons; if confessed and contrite he is purged by the demons with fire and water and a thousand kinds of torments. He who emerges purged can never afterwards laugh or play or take any pleasure in the world, but always sighs and groans and forgets the past, thinking only of the future. Or, as Gautier de Metz expresses it, in 1265—

Ki de cel liu revenuz est
Nule riens jamès ne li plest
En cest siècle, ne jamès jur
Ne rira mès, adez en plur;
E gemissent les maus ki sunt
E les pechiez ke les gens funt.

See Roquefort's notice of the poem of Marie de France on the same subject (Poésies de Marie de France, Paris, 1820, II. 409). The impression which the story made on the popular mind is seen in the number of versions of it during the thirteenth century. That the original idea was derived from the cave of Trophonius (Pausaniæ IX. xxxix.), as has been suggested, seems to me improbable, as there is no resemblance in details, but that the descent of Æneas to Hades (Æneid. VI.) may have furnished the groundwork is by no means unlikely.

Even as late as 1395, on the death of Juan I. of Aragon, his faithful chamberlain, the Vizconde de Perellós, is said to have visited St. Patrick's Purgatory in order to learn the fate of his master, and saw him suffering terrible tortures. Padre Abarca, S. J., who relates this in 1674, is at some pains to disavow belief in the story and in the supernatural terrors of the spot.—Abarca, Añales de los Reyes de Aragon, P. II. fol. 155.

Roquefort tells us (*loc. cit.* p. 406) that Alexander VI. ordered the place destroyed, and that Henry VIII. had it partially filled up, but notwithstanding this it retained the veneration of the people. About 1640 David Roth, the Catholic Bishop of Ossory, describes it as still largely frequented; in spite of the surrounding Protestant population as many as fifteen hundred pilgrims at a time are sometimes seen on the little island. The cave is so small that it will contain only nine persons, though a tenth may sometimes be squeezed in. Of course the sexes are kept separate. The demonic tribulations have disappeared, but in place of them the ceremonies occupy nine days, spent in the severest fasting on bread and water, barefooted processions over sharp rocks and stones and constant prayers, ending with confession and communion, after which the pilgrims pass a night in the cave. They were still warned of the horrors in store for them if they ventured in unrepentant and unconfessed (Migne, *loc. cit.*).

[1] P. Lombard. Sentt. Lib IV. Dist. XX., XXI., XLV. §§ 1, 5.

Cardinal Pullus, however, urges confession and penance for the reason that they relieve the sinner from the far greater purgatorial suffering of the future, which may be either in this world or in the next.[1] Still the old conception that purgatorial pains endure to the resurrection was not entirely forgotten. About 1160 a vision accorded to a dead man who revived relates that purgatory is a large and deep valley with ice on one side and flames on the other, the souls being tossed from one to the other; it is for those who postpone repentance and confession till the death-bed, and they will thus suffer until doomsday.[2]

The belief being thus established in purgatory as a place of transient punishment for sins not washed away by penance, it fitted in admirably with the sacramental theory, developed at this period,

---

[1] Card. Pulli Sentt. Lib. VI. Cap. 59, 61.

[2] Helinandi Montis Frigidi Chron. ann. 1160.

The number of visions appearing through the remainder of this century and during the next, describing in minute detail the fate of the soul, show the increased attention attracted to the future life and the industry of the clergy in awakening the fears of sinners. They culminate in the *Divina Commedia*, of which they are the precursors. For two elaborate ones see Matthew Paris, *Hist. Angl.* ann. 1196 and 1206. We learn from these that St. Nicholas presides over purgatory, whence doubtless is derived the irreverent designation of Satan as Old Nick. In the latter one a feature of purgatory is a bridge which must be passed to get to heaven; those souls for whom masses and alms are offered traverse it easily; those destitute of such aid have their bare feet pierced by the sharp points with which it is studded, they fall, are lacerated all over and roll back to the bottom. In this we may recognize a thrifty modification of the Sirat and Chinvat of the Oriental faiths, possibly brought to Europe by the Crusaders, though there is something analogous in the *Giallarbru* of the Norse mythology (Finni Magnusen Priscæ Vet. Boreal. Mythol. Lexicon, s. v. *Giöll*), from which is evidently derived the conception in the Lyke-Wake Dirge, which Scott tells us (Minstrelsy of the Scottish Border) was still in his time used by Catholics in the north of England, though there it leads to purgatory—

> From Brigg o' Dread when thou mayst passe,
> Every night and alle;
> To Purgatory fire thou comest at laste,
> And Christ receive thye saule.

In the story of Sir Owen's progress through St. Patrick's Purgatory, after traversing hell he comes to a bridge across a river so steep and narrow and slippery that it seems impassable; the demons seek to cast him from it, but as he proceeds it grows broad and easy and leads him to the terrestrial paradise.

which taught that by contrition and confession the *culpa* which condemned to hell was remitted, and there remained only the *pœna* or expiatory punishment in purgatory, and this again was removed by satisfaction, or the performance of the penance enjoined by the confessor. The whole was moulded into a consistent system, and purgatory attained the position of an article of faith, indispensable in the divine order which apportioned retribution to offence and committed to the Church the power to bind and to loose. With the evolution of theology in the hands of the schoolmen every detail became known, and purgatory assumed the character which it has since retained. Thus Alexander Hales tells us that the fire of purgatory is material and that the duration and character of punishment is proportioned to the amount of sin. All will probably suffer equally from the deprivation of the Divine Vision, but the homicide will endure a fiercer fire than the fornicator, and the latter will suffer in proportion to the pleasure which he experienced in sinning; it is true that souls in purgatory feel contrition, but it is not meritorious or sacramental contrition, and does not serve as satisfaction. Bonaventura adds that the pains are endured voluntarily, although release is desired; some hold that they are so severe as to absorb all the faculties of the soul, so that it does not know whether it is in hell or not, but this is not so, for the pains of hell are incommensurably greater, and they do not deprive souls of consciousness; in purgatory souls have a greater certainty of glory than during life; it is probably a mistake to suppose that they are tortured by demons, the matter is uncertain, but the likelihood is that this office is performed by good angels.[1]

[1] Alex. de Ales Summæ P. IV. Q. XVI. Membr. ii. Art. 4, §§ 2, 3; Q. XVII. Membr. ii. Art. 1, § 6; Membr. ii. Art. 2, § 3.—S. Bonaventuræ in IV. Sentt. Dist. XX. P. 1, Art. 1, Q. 1–3; Art. 2, Q. 1, 2.

François de Mayrone (In IV. Sentt. Dist. XX. Q. iv.), while admitting the fearful pains of purgatory, adds that the joys there are greater than any in this world, and the souls there would prefer them to any mundane delights, for a man can be blest while suffering, and they know and meditate on the Divine goodness. This speculation however threatened too seriously the profits of prayers and masses to be adopted, though I believe S. François de Sales was of the same opinion. A somewhat modified form is taught in the Roman catechism of 1545, where it is said that the souls in purgatory, secure as to the future and sustained by charity, endure their torments willingly.—Christianum de Fide et Sacramentis Edictum, p. 93 (Romæ, 1545).

Before leaving this portion of our subject it is necessary to consider the changes that have taken place in the theories as to the time at which the destiny of the soul is settled and judgment passed upon it. The discrepancy between the parable of Lazarus and the promise to the penitent thief on the one hand and belief in doomsday at the end of the world on the other might be glossed over so long as the Second Advent was momentarily expected, but as this gradually faded away it was difficult to reconcile. We have seen that some of the early writers pronounced in favor of immediate judgment, but the majority held to the postponement until the resurrection, and even when speculations commenced as to a possible period of purgatorial punishment it was expected to continue until the last day, when the eternal destiny of saints and sinners would be determined and announced.

Gradually however it became accepted that the bliss of the righteous ought not to be thus delayed. To the question whether the souls of the just are received into heaven before the resurrection Gregory I. replies that this is not to be universally affirmed or denied; some undoubtedly go there at once while others are kept waiting and pass the interval in various mansions.[1] To accommodate this belief with the received dogma of the final judgment, a place of abode was assumed, which, from the parable of Lazarus, was known as Abraham's Bosom.[2] The earliest allusion to this would seem to be in the so-called Apostolical Constitutions[3]—while in the writings which pass under the name of Denis the Areopagite, it is synonymous with the *Limbus Patrum*, for he speaks of praying that souls may be sent to the bosoms of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, a place where there is neither sorrow nor suffering.[4] This negative fate however did not satisfy the popular longings, and the Church, in its liturgies from the seventh to the eleventh centuries, constantly put up prayers that the soul for which masses were celebrated should await the first resurrection in Abraham's Bosom, which is alluded

[1] Gregor. PP. I. Dial. Lib. IV. Cap. XXV.

[2] This figurative expression for paradise or heaven was current among the Jews. Josephus even attributes it to the time of the Maccabees when he speaks of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob receiving the dead into their bosoms.—Fl. Josephi de Maccabæis § 13 (Ed. Oxon. 1720, p. 1405).

[3] Constitt. Apostol. VIII. 47.

[4] S. Dionysii de Eccles. Hierarch. Cap. vii.

to as a region of light and space and a temporary Jerusalem—a subordinate heaven in fact.[1] To Ivo of Chartres it was the highest destiny to which the soul could immediately aspire, and thus virtually was heaven, while Hugh of St. Victor asserts positively that the righteous are wafted at once to Christ and the wicked are plunged in hell.[2] With the development of the doctrine of a temporary purgatory and sacramental absolution the idea of a judgment postponed until doomsday gradually disappeared and the intervention of an intermediate state such as Abraham's Bosom became unnecessary. Aquinas asserts positively that the judgment is immediate, and that to assume otherwise is an error, but there may be other matters to be considered at doomsday, and he endeavors to explain that Abraham's Bosom is the same as the *Limbus Patrum*, but that since Christ came it is no longer part of hell, but is in fact heaven, to which the prayers of the Church ask that souls be taken, for at death all souls are either plunged into hell or ascend to heaven, save those whose passage to the latter is delayed in purgatory.[3] Other authorities agree with him that Abraham's Bosom is the same as the *Limbus Patrum*, but that it is now empty.[4] Evidently by this time there could

---

[1] Sacr. Gregorian. (Muratori T. XIII. P. II. pp. 834, 923–4, 934, 1047; P. III. p 167).—Missale Gothicum (Ibid. P. III. pp. 305, 337, 373, 394, 411, 432).—Missale Francorum (Ibid. P. III. p 496).—Missale Gallicanum (Ibid. P. III. p. 508).—Sacram. Gallican. (Ibid. P. III. pp. 624, 829, 897).—Sacramentar. Vetus (Migne, CLI. 871).—Cod. Liturg. Fontanellan. (Migne, CLI. 930, 946, 947).

[2] S. Ivon. Carnotens. Epist. CLXXIV.—H. de S. Victore de Sacramentis Lib. II. P. xvi. Cap. 4.

[3] S. Th. Aquin. Summæ P. I. Q. lxiv. Art. 4 ad 3; P. III. Q. lii. Art. 2; Q. lix. Art. 5 ad 1; Supplem. Q. lxix. Art. 2, 4.

Aquinas enumerates five receptacles for souls—paradise, *limbus patrum*, purgatory, hell, and *limbus puerorum* (Ibid. Art. 7).

[4] Fr. de Mayrone in IV. Sentt. Dist. XX. Q. 4.—Roberti Aquinat. Opus Quadragesimale Serm. 48. François de Mayrone also mentions four divisions of the infernal regions. First, the lowest, the abode of the damned; second, the *Limbus Parvulorum;* third, purgatory, for those not yet perfect; fourth, Abraham's Bosom or the *Limbus Patrum*. The occupants of the first are in actual *culpa* and pain of sense and loss (of the Divine Vision); those of the second are in original sin and only in pain of loss; those of the third are in grace and in pain; those of the fourth are in grace and in great consolation, for they have no pain.

The pain of loss (*pœna damni* or *la peine du dam*) we are assured is incom-

be little question as to the fate of the soul being decided as soon as it leaves the body. In 1254 Innocent IV., in laying down points of faith for the acceptance of the Greeks, asserts that the souls of baptized infants and of adults dying in grace without unsatisfied sin fly at once to heaven. If any doubt remained it was removed when, early in the fourteenth century, John XXII. was so ill-advised as to assert that the blessed in heaven will not enjoy the Divine Vision till the day of judgment. All Europe arose and denounced him as a heretic; he was forced to retract on his death-bed, and his successor, Benedict XII., in 1335, issued a bull emphatically asserting that souls which after baptism incur no sin, or, if sinning, have been duly purged, are at once received into heaven and enjoy the supreme bliss of the sight of God—a doctrine which was included as a point of faith in the Decree of Union with the Armenians at the council of Florence in 1439.[1] To adjust this with the Creed, the Tridentine Catechism asserts that there are two judgments—the first of which is the particular one, at death, when the soul is at once hurried to the judgment-seat of God, where all its thoughts, words and acts are investigated and its doom pronounced.[2] Thus at last a way was

---

parably greater than the torment, or *pœna sensus*.—L'Echo du Purgatoire, XIVème Année, p. 133 (Mai 1879).

It was revealed to St. Birgitta (Revelat Lib. IV. Cap. vii. n. 6, 7) that purgatory is situated on top of hell and has three stories; in the lowest the torments are similar to those of hell, though some souls suffer more and others less, according to their deserts; in the second there is only languor and debility; in the third only the *pœna damni*. Souls may be sent to either, and very few escape at least the third. Those which are consigned to the lowest pass successively through the two upper before admission to heaven, and those which are sent to the second pass through the third.

[1] Innoc. PP. IV. Epist. ad Card. Tusculan. Cap. xxv. (Harduin. VI. 366).—D'Argentré Collect. Judic. de novis Erroribus I. I. 316–22.—Conc. Florent. ann. 1439 (Harduin. IX. 986).

[2] Cat. Trident. Lib. I. P. ii. Cap. 9 § 2. The texts cited in support are Hebrews IX., Luke XVI, Ecclus. II.

At what time this doctrine of two judgments—one particular and one general—was accepted by the Church it might not be easy to determine. It is to be found in Aquinas (Summæ Suppl. Q. LXXXVIII. Art. 1 ad 1), who suggests that the particular judgment affects the soul and the general one at the resurrection affects the body. Yet, in an official catechism issued at Rome, in 1545, by the papal vicar, Bishop Archinto, prescribing the doctrine to be taught under pain of excommunication, it is simply stated that at death the good are wafted at once to heaven, the impenitent are plunged into hell and

found to reconcile the parable of Lazarus with the doctrine of the resurrection.

Naturally, as this view of the destiny of the soul developed and prevailed, the importance of the day of judgment shrank. The latter was too distinctly set forth in Scripture and in the Symbol of the Apostles to be ignored and dismissed, but it was quietly set in the background. Aquinas and Bonaventura, when asserting the immediate judgment of souls, allude to the resurrection merely as a time when the glory of the blessed will be enhanced and the torments of the damned will be sharpened; this was the view asserted by the Latins at the council of Florence in 1438, while, in 1575, Gregory XV. suppresses the day of judgment entirely in the profession of faith drawn up for acceptance by the Greeks.[1] Yet it still forms part of the received doctrines of the Church whenever they are formally stated,[2] and the *Dies Iræ* still has its place in the offices for the dead, but the principal use made of it is as a stimulus to confession, for the reason that it is vastly better to confide sins in private to the priest than to endure the humiliation of having them proclaimed to the universe at doomsday.[3]

One of the chief arguments relied upon to prove the belief of the primitive Church in purgatory is the custom which has existed from the beginning of endeavoring by religious observances to succor the souls of the departed. This would be unanswerable if the modern doctrine of a "particular judgment" had been received in the early ages, but as the belief then was that the determination is postponed until doomsday, and as the condition of departed spirits during the interval was the subject of vague and inconclusive speculation, there

---

those who die in grace with *pœna* unsatisfied are carried to purgatory. There is no allusion to a subsequent judgment.—Christianum de Fide et Sacramentis Edictum, pp. 92–3 (Romæ, 1545).

[1] S. Th. Aquin. Summæ Suppl. Q. LXIX. Art. ii.—S. Bonavent. in IV. Sentt. Dist. XXI. P. i. Art. 2, Q. 2.—Bzovii Annal. ann. 1438, n. 25.—Gregor. PP. XIII. Const. XXXIII. § 4 (Bullar. II. 429).

[2] Pii PP. IV. Bull. *Injunctum nobis*, 13 Nov. 1564 (Bullar. II. 138).—Cat. Trident. Lib. I. P. ii. Cap. 9, § 2.—Ritualis Roman. Tit. VI. Cap. 3.

[3] Gratian. post cap. 87 Caus. XXXIII. Q. iii. Dist. 1.—P. Lombard. Sentt. Lib. IV. Dist. xvii. § 6.—Concil. Wigorn. ann. 1240, Cap. 16 (Harduin. VII. 336).—Confessionale Raynaldi, c. 1476.—Leuterbreuver, La Confession coupée, Paris, 1751.—Joseph Faà di Bruno, Catholic Belief, p. 310.

was no difficulty in imagining that the living might by earnest prayer and sacrifice propitiate an offended God and secure some greater measure of mercy in the final doom. The infinite yearning of loving hearts to aid those whom they had lost, and the hope of rejoining them in a blessed eternity, would alone suffice to stimulate such a belief, but, even without these incentives, the struggling Church would have had slender chance of securing converts if it had disclaimed all power to succor the dead and had admitted that it abandoned them to the justice of God, while proclaiming under divine sanction a code of morality far more rigid than that accepted by the easy-going gentile world, and insisting on the infinite disparity between the present and the future life. All its converts, in fact, had been trained in the belief that the dead could be assisted by the living, and that the observances requisite for this were a supreme duty. Save the pre-exilian Hebrews, who denied immortality, and their successors the Sadducees, all races and religions of the ancient civilized world were agreed as to this, and when, after the Hasmonean revolution the Pharisees became dominant in Judea, the custom became general of praying for the dead—a custom which they had acquired from their Persian masters along with the belief in the future life.[1] The passage in II. Maccabees XII. 43–6, which has been the stronghold of the Church in defending the practice of suffrages for the dead, only shows by the argumentative clause, "For if he had not hoped that they that were slain should rise again it would have seemed superfluous and vain to pray for the dead," that the Pharisaical party sought to strengthen itself by the authority of the national hero, Judas Maccabæus.[2] In this it succeeded, though

[1] The Yazishne sacrifice of the Mazdeans, which bears so strange a resemblance to the mass, is like it performed for the benefit of the dead. Arda-Viraf. II. 28 (Haug's Translation, p. 151).—Shayast-la-Shayast, XVII. (West's Pahlavi Texts, I. 382).

[2] The Jews themselves rejected from the canon the two books of Maccabees, and modern Jewish scholars are inclined to regard them as political manifestoes, Book I, in the interest of the Sadducees, and Book II., in that of the Pharisees (Cohen, Les Pharisiens, I. 168–73). They were not accepted by the early Church without question. About 350 the council of Laodicæa (Cap. 60) rejected them, while in 397 the third council of Carthage (Cap. 47) accepted them. Finally they were included in the canon by the council of Rome, under Gelasius, in 494—probably on account of the passage in question. In the Protestant Bible they are included among the Apocrypha.

for some time there was discussion, as to the duration of future punishment, between the schools of Hillel and Shammai, when the milder views of Hillel gradually prevailed which limited torment to twelve months, and as this is the extreme for the impious a son is required to recite the prayer Kaddish for the soul of his father daily for eleven months, as he is not to presume that his father was impious.[1]

Among the Hindus the Sraddha, the sacrifice to the Pitris or souls of the ancestors, was an immemorial custom of the highest obligation, and the institution of levirate marriage was designed to raise up descendants for this purpose to those who had died childless.[2] In the strange eschatology of Egypt, which taught a perpetual mysterious connection between the body and its departed soul, offerings of food and wine, sacrificial victims and prayer were requisite for the welfare of the dead, and the omission of a name from the series of ancestors thus remembered was a severe punishment only to be inflicted for unpardonable crime.[3] In Greece the supreme duty owed by the living to the dead is emphatically asserted in Antigone's answer to Creon, when she had disobeyed his commands as to the body of Polynices, and defiantly told him that the laws of the gods were superior to his. Nor was this a mere passing observance, for

[1] Buxtorfi Synagog. Jud. Cap. 49. A story from the Talmud, quoted by Buxtorf, bears a curious resemblance to those told by Gregory I. R. Akiba in travelling met a man staggering under a load of wood sufficient for a horse and asked him whether he was a man or a spectre. The stranger replied that he was dead and was obliged to carry daily to Gehenna the wood wherewith to burn him. Akiba inquired whether he had a son and where he lived, went there and taught him the Kaddish. After the son had performed this duty for awhile the spirit appeared to Akiba and reported that it was released from torment and was in Gan Eden.

Other authorities were even more merciful. R. Johanan ben Nuri limited torment to the fifty days from Passover to Pentecost (Mishna, Edioth, II. 10). There would appear, however, even yet not to be an entire consensus of opinion on this point, for a will of a Jew recently probated in Philadelphia bequeathed to a synagogue the income of $500 for sixty years for prayers to be recited for the benefit of his soul.

When David, in his grief over Absalom, cried out eight times "O Absalom, my son!" each of the first seven ejaculations released the soul of Absalom from one of the stations in Gehenna.—Wagenseilii Sota, pp. 210–11. Cf. p. 220.

[2] Manava Dharma Sastra IV. 257; VI. 1–81.

[3] Mariette Bey, La Musée de Boulaq, pp. 28–9, 44, 47, 73, 103, 105, 119, 121, 199, 235, 317.

Plutarch tells us that in his time was still continued the feeding of those who had fallen at Platæa, nearly six hundred years before.[1] Lucian describes the popular belief as holding that the good enjoy eternal bliss in Elysium; the wicked undergo eternal torment in Tartarus; while the numerous indifferent wander as shades in Hades, disappearing like smoke to the touch, nourished by the libations made to them and by the sacrifices at their tombs. He who has left no friend or kindred starves and is tortured with hunger.[2]

Italiote belief was similar. The Etruscans held the nether world to be a place of pure torment, which could only be brought to an end through certain mysterious rites performed by the living, which transferred the soul to the celestial regions.[3] Among the Romans the succors rendered to the dead were very elaborate and were matters of indispensable obligation. The funeral rites were costly, but the heir was required to perform them, and he who contributed anything to those of another's dead could recover it from the representatives, or a widower could deduct it from the *dos* of the wife, for they were requisite to the comfort of the shade in the nether world.[4] After this came the *sacrum novendiale* or offerings made on the ninth day, the *parentalia*, and the *feralia* or annual celebrations at the tomb, in which milk, wine and blood were offered for the sustenance of the shades, and these were required to be perpetual.[5]

Thus not only were the original disciples of Christ trained in the duty of succoring the dead, but all the gentiles from among whom their converts were drawn had kindred beliefs. Christianity was too spiritual to accept the grosser superstition of material aid in food for the shades, but the undetermined condition of the soul in the interval between death and doomsday offered ample scope for observances whereby the mercy of God could be invoked or his justice be placated. There is a curious passage in St. Paul which shows that

---

[1] Sophoclis Antig. 450–7.—Plutarchi Vit. Aristidis.

[2] Luciani de Luctu 7, 8, 9. Cf. Odysseæ XI. 23 sqq.

[3] Mommsen's Rome, I. 189.

[4] Festus s. v. *Sine sacris.*—Pauli Sentt. Receptt. I. xxi. 10, 11.—Virg. Æneid. VI. 224–7; X. 517–20; XI. 80–4.—Lucani Pharsal. VIII. 751.—Statii Thebaid. VI. 126.

[5] Festus s. vv. *Respersum, Fabam.*—Macrob. Sat. I. 10.—Varro *ap.* Macrob. I. 4.—Virg. Æneid. V. 77–80.—Plutarchi Cato Major, XV. 3.—Ovid. Fastor. II. 532–66.—Ciceronis de Legibus II. 8, 9, 19, 20.

in the Apostolic Church there was already a belief that the vicarious baptism of a survivor could effect the redemption of the dead, and that this was practised as a usual custom, presumably for converts who had not yet been admitted to the rite.[1] Prayers for the dead also were regarded from a very early period as efficacious, for although the Apology of Aristides makes no allusion to them, and assumes that nothing can be done for those who die in sin, yet we are told that, at the death of Addai the Apostle, all the members of the church went to his tomb from time to time and prayed there diligently and commemorated his death annually as he had commanded of them.[2] Tertullian also speaks of prayers for the dead and of the oblations annually offered for them that they might partake of the first resurrection and have repose during the interval.[3] The power ascribed to prayer is very significantly illustrated, in 208, in the Passion of St. Perpetua, who relates that when in prison awaiting her martyrdom she suddenly uttered the name of Dinocrates, a brother of whom she had long ceased to think, as he had died of cancer at the age of seven. She commenced to pray for him, and that night had a vision in which she saw him coming out from a dark place, devoured with thirst and seeking to drink from a cistern which was beyond his reach. She continued to pray for him till her transfer to her final prison, when she had another vision in which she saw him bright and happy; the cistern only reached his waist and he drank and played with the water. As she belonged to a pagan family her child brother had evidently been unbaptized; his spirit desired baptism after death and her prayers accomplished what the vicarious baptism of apostolic times had sought.[4] The commemorations for the dead, alluded to by Ter-

[1] I. Cor. xv. 29. "Otherwise what shall they do that are baptized for the dead, if the dead rise not again at all? Why are they then baptized for them?" There is also a symbolical allusion to baptism after death in the Shepherd of Hermas, Lib. III. Vis. ix. n. 16.

[2] Apology of Aristides Ch. xv. (Rendel Harris's Transl. p. 50).—Doctrine of Addai the Apostle (Phillips's Translation, p. 47).

[3] Tertull. de Corona Militis Cap. 3; de Monogam. Cap. 10; de Exhort. Castitat. Cap. 11. The oblation rendered the soul for which it was offered a participant in the mysteries of the Eucharist.

[4] Passionis SS. Perpetuæ et Felicitatis Cap. II. §§ 3, 4. This celebrated case is one of the main arguments of the Church to prove early belief in purgatory, it being assumed that Dinocrates was there and was released by the prayers of his sister. That it was regarded in the fourth and fifth centuries as indi-

tullian as a settled custom of the Church, are recognized and described by Hippolytus, and by the time of the Apostolic Constitutions we have the formulas of the prayers employed, supplicating God to pardon the sins of the deceased, voluntary and involuntary, and place his soul in Abraham's Bosom. We learn, moreover, that this was customary on the third, ninth and fortieth days and on the anniversary.[1] In this there is no allusion to the performance of mass, nor do we find it in the request which, in 250, Celerinus sent from Rome to Carthage for aid in redeeming the soul of his sister, who had died after lapsing in the Decian persecution. He was performing heavy vicarious penance for her, and this he hopes, with the prayers of the Carthaginian confessors and martyrs, will procure her pardon.[2] Cyprian, however, attached a special value to commemoration in the service of the mass, which was efficacious both for the living and the dead; in the case of the latter special offices were recited on anniversaries and other commemorations,[3] and this came

---

cating his baptism after death is shown by the efforts of St. Augustin to disprove it, but he is reduced to the argument that if this were so it would have been stated in the account, and he might have committed sin at the age of seven, besides the *Passio* is not a canonical writing (S. Augustini de Anima et ejus Origine I. 12. Cf. II. 14, 16; III. 12; IV. 27). As a young child at the age of seven in a pagan family he could not have been baptized—nor, if he had, would he have been responsible for sin. Dr. Robinson, to whose edition of the *Passio* (Cambridge, 1891, p. 29) I am indebted for these references, also points out that the word used for the cistern, *piscina*, ecclesiastically suggests the baptismal font.

[1] Canon. Hippolyti XXXIII. 169 (Achelis, p. 106).—Constitt. Apostol. VIII. 47, 48. The third day was symbolical of Christ's resurrection (Isidori Pelusiotæ Epist. 114). The ninth and the anniversary were borrowed from the pagan *novendialia* and *parentalia*, the fortieth was in imitation of the forty days' mourning of the Jews for Moses (Constitt. Apost. *loc. cit.*).

[2] Cypriani Epist. XXI.

[3] Ejusd. Epist. XXXIX. To be remembered by name in the mass was a reward for benefactions. When, in 253, a barbarian inroad carried into slavery a number of Numidian Christians and Cyprian made collections to purchase their liberation, in sending the money to the Numidian bishops he added a list of the donors with a request that they should be remembered in the prayers and sacrifices (Epist. LXII.). Thus arose the use of diptychs, in which were inscribed the names of benefactors and others; no special service distinguished the living from the dead, except that in the prayer absolution is asked for the dead and salvation for the living (Missale Gothicum, *ap.* Muratori T. XIII. P. III. p. 265). Sometimes the names were

to be regarded as the most powerful means of atoning for the sins of the departed and of winning the mercy of God. It was the sole reliance of St. Arsenius on his death-bed, when he forbade his brethren to do anything else for him.[1] Chrysostom took the same view; of all means of succoring the dead the best is the mention of the name in the sacred mysteries, a custom of which he attributes the origin to the apostles, though there is benefit in the charities and prayers of the faithful, for all are members of one body. Even the resignation of the survivor is of service, while lamentation and weeping provoke the wrath of God.[2]

individually recited and sometimes they were merely alluded to in block as those which were written in front of the altar (Sacrament. Gregorian. *ap.* Muratori T. XIII. P. II. pp. 851, 923–4; Missale Gothicum, Ibid. P. III. p. 301; Sacrament. Gallican. Ibid. pp. 839–40). The latter became a necessity when the lists in course of time grew to inordinate length, as that of St. Gall, which contained several thousand names, commemorated on Nov. 14 (Goldast. et Senckenb. Rer. Alamann. Scriptt. II. 157). It was deemed necessary to continue this aid to the soul indefinitely. In the seventh century, on the day of St. Leo I., who died in 461, the formula of the prayer is "Annue nobis, Domine, ut animæ famuli tui Leonis hæc prosit oblatio quam immolando totius mundi tribuisti relaxari delicta" (Sacram. Gregorian. *ap.* Muratori, T. XIII. P. II. p. 650), though this was subsequently altered to an invocation of the suffrage of St. Leo—"Annue Domine, quæsumus, per intercessionem beati Leonis hæc nobis prosit oblatio" (Pet. Hieremiæ Quadragesimale, de Peccato, Serm. XXV.). A thirteenth century necrology of the nuns of St. Julia of Brescia, printed by Muratori (Antiq. Ital. Diss. 68) contains the name of Ethelwulf, King of the West Saxons, who died in 858. St. Monica had lived a most saintly life, yet fifteen years after her death St. Augustin is still praying for her (Confessionum Lib. IX. Cap. 13).

[1] Vitæ Patrum Lib. III. Cap. 163 (Migne, LXXII. 794).

[2] S. Jo. Chrysost. in Epist. ad Philippens. Homil. III. n. 4; In Epist. I. ad Corinth. Homil. XLI. n. 5. The Christian was taught to repress all outward manifestation of grief at the loss of beloved ones. See St. Augustin's touching account of the death of his mother Monica and his insistance on his own stoicism in spite of his bitter grief "sauciabatur anima mea et quasi dilaniabatur vita, quæ una facta erat ex mea et illius" (Confessionum Lib. IX. Cap. 12).

The same idea as to the injury inflicted on the dead by the grief of the survivor is found in the Zoroastrian law, which forbade lamentations for the righteous and taught that all tears shed for the departed formed a river which was a barrier to the passage of the bridge Chinvat.—Vendidad, Farg. III. 35–7. —Arda-Viraf, Chap. XVI.—Sad der, Porta XCVII. A later myth describes a river in hell formed by the tears shed for the dead, in which are drowned those who are mourned for.—Dabistan (Shea's Translation, I. 294).

St. Augustin, of course, makes frequent reference to the subject. As for the funeral rites to which such extreme importance was subsequently attributed, he is led, by consideration of the innumerable corpses left unburied at the sack of Rome by Alaric, in 410, to the conclusion that they are a solace for the living and not an assistance to the dead, who can know nothing about them.[1] All that the living can do is by the sacrifice of the altar, by prayer and by almsgiving, and these are only of benefit to those who have rendered themselves worthy of such assistance—a limitation to which he is not always consistent. This he says has been handed down from the Fathers, and is practised universally by the Church. He also shows that already had commenced the custom of invoking the suffrage of the saints when he argues that the only advantage of burial near their tombs is that it may remind the living to commend them to those saints as patrons. He further objects to the commemoration on the ninth day as derived from the pagan *novendialia*, and prefers the seventh day, because seven days of lamentation were prescribed at the funeral of Jacob.[2]

Though St. Augustin speaks of these customs as universal there were some who denied their efficacy. Epiphanius describes the Aerians as heretics, who, among their other errors, held that such observances were inefficient and argued that otherwise a man might live as he pleased if he could purchase or beg enough prayers for himself after his death.[3] S. Salvianus was no heretic, yet he teaches that the soul before the judgment-seat of God can find no aid save in its own innocence and virtues and repentance, thus excluding all

---

[1] S. August. de Civ. Dei Lib. I. Cap. 12, 13.

[2] Ejusd. de Cura pro Mortuis Cap. 4, 18; Serm. CLXXII. Cap. 2; Quæstt. in Heptateuch. Lib. I. Q. 172.

The substitution of the seventh for the ninth day prevailed, and the fortieth was changed to the thirtieth, so that from at least the seventh century to the present time the services have been held on the third, seventh, and thirtieth days and on the anniversary —Sacram. Gelasian. Lib. III. n. 105.—Amalarii de Eccles. Offic. Lib. III. Cap. 44.—Ps. Alcuini de Eccles. Offic. Lib. III. Cap. 50, 51.—Dithmari Merseburgens. Chron. Lib. VI. Cap. 43.—Ritualis Roman. Tit. VI. Cap. 4.

Evodius, writing to St. Augustin, speaks only of mass on the third day.—S. Augustin. Epist. CLVIII.

[3] Epiph. Panar. Hæres. 75.

succor from the acts of others.[1] On the other hand, we are told that when St. Honoré was elevated to the see of Arles he forthwith spent all the accumulated treasures of his church in celebrations for the dead, so that the givers might themselves have the benefit of their oblations.[2] In fact, the belief was too productive to the Church, both in influence and money, not to be developed to its utmost possibilities. The Sacramentaries of the following centuries show us how large a portion of the services consisted in mortuary masses, and when in these the prayers solicited the pardon of all sins in return for the tremendous sacrifice of the Eucharist the inference to the minds of the faithful was that the request must be granted.[3] The suffrages of the saints were also invoked, and it was assumed that they would be freely given.[4] All this was to be paid for, then as now, and the "alms" must have formed a considerable portion of the revenues of the priest.[5] It was not sufficient that the name should be inscribed on the diptychs, but special masses—*missæ adventitiæ*—were celebrated for the benefit of the soul of a single individual. St. Augustin had one thus sung for his mother, St. Monica, at her funeral, and this was evidently the custom with those who cared for the soul of the departed,[6] but a single observance such as this grew insufficient and they became enormously multiplied, to the advantage of the officiating priest at a time when he was not restricted in the performance of his sacred functions. About the year 600 Gregory of Tours happens to mention the case of a widow

[1] S. Salviani adv. Avaritiam Lib. III. Cap. 3.

[2] S. Hilarii Arelatens. Vit. S. Honorati Cap. 6.

[3] "Hanc igitur oblationem quam tibi pro defunctis offerimus Domine . . . concedas ut ab omnibus quæ per terrenam conversationem traxerunt his sacrificiis emundentur."—Sacram. Gelasian. Lib. III. n. 104.

"Da propitius veniam peccatorum ut a cunctis reatibus absolutis sine fine lætantur."—Ib. n. 103.

[4] Sacrament. Leonianum, Super Defunctos, 4, 5. Astesanus tells us (Summæ Lib. II. Tit. xxxviii. Art. 1, Q. 1) that the perfection of beatitude for the saints depends upon their being praised and invoked by men, and in assisting those who invoke them.

[5] Sacrament. Gregorian. (Muratori T. XIII. P. II. p. 850). When the Venerable Bede was on his death-bed he said that he could not, like the rich, give gold and silver, but he nevertheless begged his brethren to be diligent in praying and celebrating mass for him.—Cuthberti Vit. Bedæ, Cap. 5.

[6] S. August. Confess. Lib. IX. Cap. 12.

who ordered a daily mass for a year for the soul of her husband and supplied every day a pint of choice wine for the celebration; the knavish subdeacon drank it and substituted vinegar till the soul of the dead man appeared to the widow and complained that she gave him vinegar to drink.[1] At the council of Attigny, in 765, attended by twenty-seven bishops and seventeen abbots, it was unanimously agreed that when any of those present should die he should have the benefit of a hundred masses celebrated by priests and three hundred by bishops, and they all signed a contract to that effect.[2] It was inevitable that succor for the dead on so large a scale should be paid for by those unable to reciprocate in this way; it was inevitable that the belief should be propagated that the more liberal the payment the surer the sinner would be of salvation, and it was further inevitable that this should be the source of innumerable scandals and of debasing the sacred functions of the priest to a mercenary struggle for the opportunity of selling his promises of salvation.[3]

[1] Gregor. Turonens. de Gloria Confessor. Cap. 65. A nice question arose whether it is better to have a daily mass sung for a year or 365 masses in a week by fifty-two priests. The answer is that the former is more meritorious, but the latter brings speedier relief.—Pet. Hieremiæ Quadragesimale, de Peccato, Serm. XXVI.

[2] C. Attiniacens. ann. 765 (Harduin. III. 2009). In 1114 the prelates assembled at the council of Compostella entered into a similar agreement to assist each other to attain eternal bliss.—Hist. Compostellan. Lib. I. Cap. 101.

[3] Thus, in 895, the council of Tribur (Cap. 15) orders the dead to be brought to the episcopal seat for interment, or if that is too far to some monastery, or if that is too difficult they can be buried where they pay their tithes—the object evidently being to secure the bequests and oblations. The greed thus displayed did not diminish with time. Several councils in the early part of the thirteenth century forbid priests from compelling the dying to leave legacies for the celebration of masses, from entering into bargains for yearly, three-yearly or seven-yearly masses, and from so burdening themselves with masses that they have to hire priests to celebrate them or sell them out to others (C. Parisiens. ann. 1212, P. I. Cap 11; Constitt. Richardi Poore Episc. Saresburiens. ann. 1217, Cap. 15; Constitt. S. Edmundi Cantuarens. circa ann. 1236, Cap. 8). In 1203 Guillaume le Maire, Bishop of Anjou, complains that priests celebrating mortuary masses exact fourteen deniers from the heirs or executors, in consequence of which, when they hear of a coming funeral, they leave their churches, and, like crows or vultures on the scent of carrion, they rush from five or six leagues around and in an unseemly crowd, to the scandal of the people, they quarrel as to who shall perform the service, sometimes even

There are few indications in the earlier periods of the direct application of these remedial agencies to the relief of souls in purgatory, though in the two cases of localized punishment related by Gregory I., one is remitted by the mass and the other by prayer. The first general assertion of the principle that I have met with does not occur

---

resorting to blows, wherefore he orders that in future the representatives of the dead shall select the officiating priest, and he shall be content with what they voluntarily give.—Guillel. Major. Andegav. Synod. XIV. ann. 1303, Cap. 3 (D'Achery, I. 741).

The thin disguise of simony by calling the payment "alms" is quaintly revealed by Bart. de Chaimis (Interrogator. fol. 91*b*), who, after instructing the confessor to inquire of priestly penitents whether they have bargained about the celebration of mortuary masses, for it is simony, adds that laymen may be excused if, through simplicity and in accordance with custom, they use in these transactions the expression of purchase, for their pious intention is rather to be regarded than their words.

The troubles arising from the "stipend" paid for masses are incurable. In 1625 Urban VIII. forbade the practice of taking orders for them and then subletting at lower prices. The Congregation of the Council of Trent soon after prohibited the custom of celebrating one mass for several payments, and, in 1659, it condemned the doctrine that when a priest had received the price of a mass he could also sell his own share in it. Yet, in 1665, Alexander VII. was obliged formally to condemn propositions justifying all these abuses (Decret. 1665, Prop. 8, 9, 10). Caietano argued that if a mass is offered for a thousand persons, each one derives from it the same benefit as if it were specially for himself, but Domingo Soto denounced this opinion as scandalous, because it tended to divert the faithful from offering "alms" for special masses. —Juenin de Sacram. Diss. v. Q. vii. Cap. 1, Art. 5.

Churches had little scruple in accepting payments for more masses than they could celebrate. Julius II. and Leo X. sought to relieve the regular Orders by authorizing the generals to issue dispensations to their priests, whereby a mass with nine collects would satisfy for nine masses (Summa Diana s. v. *Missarum reductio* n. 5). The council of Trent adopted a more comprehensive measure (Sess. XXV. De Reform. Cap. iv.) by authorizing the bishops in their synods, and the abbots and generals in their chapters, to make such provision as might comport with the honor of God, the needs of the Church and the commemoration of the dead who had left pious legacies for the salvation of their souls, which is held to mean that they can reduce the burden of masses (Diana *ubi sup.* n. 1–4). That the faithful do not always receive the benefit paid for would appear from the case of Juan de la Vega, Carmelite Provincial, tried by the Inquisition of Logroño, in 1743, for so-called Molinism. He denied the charge under torture, but confessed that he had received payment for 11,800 masses which had never been celebrated.—Llorente, Hist. Crit. de l'Inq. IV. 37.

until the middle of the ninth century, when Haymo of Halberstadt says that those not wicked enough for damnation nor good enough for immediate salvation can, through the supplications of the Church, be liberated with remedial pains, which last till doomsday, unless shortened by the prayers and weeping of friends, almsgiving and the mass.[1] This infers that the function of the Church is to relieve from hell, and the fact is that during the whole period prior to the development of the sacramental theory there was the vaguest conception as to the extent and value of these intercessory observances. The existence of purgatory was so nebulous and uncertain that to limit the influence of the Church to relief from it was not calculated to stimulate the fruitful devotion of the faithful, and there was claimed a power, more or less definite, to preserve the sinner from hell, or at least to mitigate his sufferings there. Chrysostom teaches that prayers and almsgiving for those who have died in sin, for catechumens, and even for pagans, afford them some comfort, though not much.[2] St. Augustin, as usual, is inconsistent in his utterances. In one passage he asserts that damnation can thus be rendered more endurable,[3] while again he says it is heretical to offer the sacrifice of the mass for the unbaptized, and one might as well pray for Satan and his angels as for wicked Christians in hell.[4] Throughout the middle ages there was a legend current that Gregory the Great rescued the soul of Trajan from hell by praying for him, which gave infinite trouble to the schoolmen after the question of such interposition had been decided in the negative.[5] However this may be, Gregory him-

---

[1] Haymonis Halberstat. de Varietate Libror. Lib. III. Cap. 7, 8, 9.

[2] S. Jo. Chrysost. in Epist. ad Philippens. Homil. III. n. 4.

[3] "Quibus autem prosunt aut ad hoc prosunt ut sit plena remissio aut certe ut tolerabilior fiat ipsa damnatio."—S. August. Enchirid. Cap. 110.

When the Church finally decided that it was powerless to relieve souls in hell this passage gave much trouble, which was only removed by arguing that St. Augustin used *damnatio* in the sense of condemnation to purgatory.—Astesani Summæ Lib. III. Tit. xxxvii. Art. 3, Q. 3.

[4] S. August. de Anima Lib. I. Cap. xi.; Lib. II. Cap. xi.; De Civ. Dei Lib. XXI. Cap. xxiv. n. 1, 2.

[5] Aquinas (Summæ Suppl. Q. LXXI. Art. 5 ad 5) suggests that Trajan was probably recalled to life and acquired grace, or that he was not definitely condemned to hell, or that his sentence was suspended until the day of judgment. François de Mayrone (In IV. Sentt. Dist. XXI. Q. 5, Art. 3) states that Gregory was sharply punished for his indiscretion by severe suffering during life, which

self entertained no doubt as to the power of the mass to confer absolution after death and to release from damnation, for he relates that when he was abbot of S. Andrea, in 590, three gold pieces were found among the effects of Justus, one of his monks, who was dying. Gregory ordered the body to be thrust into a dunghill and for thirty days withheld all mortuary services; then for thirty days more he had mass celebrated for the soul, after which the spirit of the deceased appeared to his brother Copiosus and announced that he had received communion and was happy after suffering.[1] This was the unquestioned belief of the Church in those ages. The liturgies of the period are full of formulas which show that the prayers in the masses were not to relieve from purgatorial pains, but to release from

---

Domingo Soto (In IV. Sentt. Dist. XLV. Q. ii. Art. 2, Concl. 1), on the authority of Alonso de Avila, assures us was a disease of the stomach. William of Ware accepts the story and adds (In IV. Sentt. Dist. XXI., that Dagobert I. was similarly released at the intercession of St. Denis (doubtless because Dagobert built the abbey of St. Denis), and also a Franciscan of the convent of Vannes, who was saved by the merits of St. Catherine. Even in the last century Peter Dens (Theologia, Tract. de Quatuor Noviss. No. 20), while saying that the story of Trajan is now considered to be a fable, asserts that in all such cases the sentence of condemnation has not been definitive.

[1] S. Gregor. PP. I. Dial. Lib. IV. Cap. 55, 57.—Joann. Diac. Vit. S. Gregor. Lib. I. Cap. xvi.

This is commonly cited in proof of the existence of purgatory, but in error. Justus had died in mortal sin unconfessed, and consequently was condemned to hell, whence he was extricated by the mass. Adrian VI. (Disput. in IV. Sentt. fol. clxvii. col. 1) endeavors to elude this by assuming that Justus had repented during life. A somewhat similar story is told of Peter the Venerable, Abbot of Cluny, about the middle of the twelfth century. Three coins were found in the clothes of one of his monks who had just died. Peter ordered the body to be thrown out, when it was enclosed in a cask and rolled away. After a time the spirit appeared to various monks begging for Christian burial, but Peter was implacable until the spirit brought to the prior a letter addressed to him by Jesus Christ, ordering him to show mercy. Then the cask was brought back, the body was found uncorrupted and was buried in due form, after which the visitations ceased—showing that even Christ could not release the soul without the ceremonies of the Church.—Rodulfi Vit. Petri Vener. Cap. 9 (Martene Ampl. Coll. VI. 1196).

We have see above (p. 325) how little importance St. Augustin attached to the funeral rites, and this saner view has revived in modern times. Domingo Soto (In IV. Sentt. Dist. XLV. Q. 2, Art. 3) says that it makes no difference where a man is buried—on the battle-field, at sea or in church, but the funeral services and oblations are an assistance to his soul.

hell,[1] and a survival of this in the modern ritual, after such power has been disclaimed, has not been found easy of explanation.[2]

It is true that, in 738, Gregory III. solved the doubts of St. Boniface by instructing him that the prayers and oblations of the Church were not to be offered for impious Christians, but some Irish canons of the period explain that they are performed for the righteous in thanks, for the wicked as consolation for the living, for those not wholly bad that damnation may be rendered more endurable, for those not wholly good that they may gain full remission, and in the next century Haymo of Halberstadt takes virtually the same position.[3] Not long after this occurred the letter of John VIII. to the Frankish bishops, already alluded to (p. 132), in which he assumed, as far as was right, to absolve and commend to God those who had fallen in battle with the pagans in defence of the Christian faith.[4] With the

---

[1] "Precibus imploremus ut eductis a Tartaro defunctorum spiritibus non prævaleant sepultis infernæ portæ per crimina, quas per apostoli fidem vinci credit ecclesia."—Missale Gothicum (Muratori T. XIII. P. III. p. 283; Cf. pp. 253, 323, 400, 403).—Sacrament. Gallican. (Ibid. p. 669, 898, 899).—Excerptt. ex Codd. Liturg. Fontanellan. (Migne, CLI. 930).

[2] In the mass for the dead there is the prayer "Libera animas omnium fidelium defunctorum de pœnis inferni et de profundo lacu; libera eas de ore leonis, ne absorbeat eas tartarus."—Missal for the Laity (Phila., 1861, p. 515).

St. Antonino (Summæ P. III. Tit. xxxii. Cap. 1, § 2) endeavors to get over the inconsistency of this with the revised doctrine of the Church by suggesting that "infernus" is here to be taken in a large sense as including purgatory; he prudently, however, says nothing about the deep lake, the lion's mouth and Tartarus, which latter is always used as a synonym of hell. Adrian VI. (Disput. in IV. Sentt. fol. clxvi.) more wisely confines himself to explaining away the word "absorbeat," and leaves the rest of the prayer severely alone.

[3] Gregor. PP. III. Epist. I. Cap. 3 (Bened. Levitæ Capit. VII. 407.—Cap. 13 Caus. XIII. Q. ii.).—Pœnitent. Martenian. Cap. xiv. (Wasserschleben, p. 286).—Haymonis Halberstat. de Varietate Libror. Lib. III. Cap. 9. So also Ps. Alcuin. de Divinis Officiis Lib. III. Cap. 50. This rule of action was sure to prevail, as it not only avoided passing judgment on the deceased, but was much more profitable to the clergy.

[4] Johann. PP. VIII. Epist. 186. The assumption of absolution in this case would appear to be perfectly superfluous, as in the commencement of the epistle he asserted that those who thus were slain were certain of repose in eternal life, and in this he only repeated an assurance given some twenty or thirty years before by Leo IV. (Epist. 1). The epistle of John VIII. has been largely used as evidence both of the power of the keys and of early granting

gradual development of the power of the keys, and in the confused conceptions still existing as to the future state, the belief was accepted that absolution could be granted after death. In 1002, at the obsequies of Otho III. at Cologne on Holy Thursday, the archbishop granted remission to his soul, and when, in 1077, the Empress Agnes died in Rome, Gregory VII., after several days spent in masses and prayers for her soul, gave her remission of her sins.[1] With the rise of scholastic theology in the next century all this was recognized as incompatible with the theories which were being so rapidly moulded into a system, and as early as the time of Cardinal Pullus the principle was emphatically expressed that the sacerdotal power expires with death—the Church has no jurisdiction over the world to come.[2] This principle became a common-place of the schools, but it was not easy to abandon wholly a power once claimed and exercised. Innocent III. decided that a man dying under excommunication, but with signs of repentance, is to be absolved after death, and this was extended to all sinners manifesting repentance and unable to obtain the sacrament. In these cases, however, it is assumed that they are absolved by God, and that the Church only publishes the fact.[3]

With the definite distinction that became established between hell and purgatory, and the development of the sacramental system with its assured power of relief from eternal torment, there arose a natural disposition to restrict more vigorously the benefit of the suffrages of the Church to those who were assumably in purgatory. The unrepentant sinner who had died without the sacrament was denied Christian sepulture, masses and prayers, but whether masses and prayers were beneficial to souls in hell still for a time remained a disputed question. One of the errors of Gilbert de la Porrée, con-

---

of indulgences, but the passage in question is evidently only a meaningless expression of encouragement to those who were struggling with the Norsemen.

[1] Dithmari Merseburg. Chron. Lib. IV. Cap. 33.—Berthold. Constant. Annal. ann. 1077.

[2] R. Pulli. Sententt. Lib. VI. Cap. lviii.—"Dum super terram sunt suos presbyteri noverunt parrochianos; cum sub terram vadunt in summi sacerdotis diœcesim transeunt. In alienum jus manum non porrigas."

"Ita quoque verba Domini consulens attende id solum ad curam tuam pertinere quamvis super terram judices, non etiam sub terra putrescentem."—Ibid. Cap. lxi.

[3] Cap. 28 Extra Lib. V. Tit. xxxix.—Hostiens. Aureæ Summæ Lib. V. De Remiss. § 6.—Astesani Summæ Lib. V. Tit. xvi.

demned in the council of Paris in 1147, was his denial of the necessity of the sacrament, and his assertion that all who are baptized will be saved, but his disciples seem to have abandoned this, while arguing that suffrages for the damned diminish their torment by subdivision, so that, however long continued the former might be, there would always be something left of the latter.[1] William of Auxerre attempted a compromise by suggesting that suffrages for the damned give them comfort but not mitigation or release; others held that prior to doomsday souls in hell can be helped, but not subsequently; others again that those who die without faith or the sacrament cannot be aided, but those can be who die in the Church and are not wholly wicked.[2] The garrulous Cæsarius of Heisterbach manifests the confusion of ideas current by asserting in one passage that prayers, masses and alms lighten the endless pains in hell of those not wholly bad, while in another he says that such attempts to assist them only injure them—a belief which we find as late as the fifteenth century.[3] The cautious St. Ramon de Peñafort declines to decide whether the good works of the living can benefit souls in hell; he states the opinions on either side and merely remarks that one seems to be more merciful and the other more orthodox.[4] Johannes Teutonicus, whose Gloss on the Decretum enjoyed immense authority, recurs to the opinion of St. Augustin

---

[1] Otton. Frisingens. de Gestis Frid. I. Lib. I. Cap. 50.—S. Th. Aquin. Summæ Suppl. Q. LXXI Art. 5, *in corp.*

[2] S. Th. Aquin. *ubi sup.*

[3] Cæsar. Heisterbacens. Dial. Dist. XII. Cap. iii. xxxix.

In a curious fifteenth century poem, "The Adulterous Falmouth Squire," the son of the sinner is brought to him in hell by an angel to witness his sufferings, when the father addresses him:

> Sonne, thu shalt be a preeste, y wote it wele;
> Onys or this day seven yere,
> Att messe ne matynes, mette ne mele,
> Thou take me neuer in thi prayer;
> Loke, sonne, thu do as y the saye!
> Therfore y warne the wele before,
> For euer the lenger thu prayes for me
> My paynes shall be more and more.
>
> Political, Religious and Love Poems, p. 100 (Early English Text Soc. 1866).

[4] S. Raymundi Summæ Lib. III. Tit. xxxiv. § 4.

that those not wholly bad can thus obtain mitigation of torment, though not release.[1] Cardinal Henry of Susa imitates the caution of S. Ramon in avoiding a decision, but he manifests the progress of opinion by telling us that the prevailing belief is that souls in hell cannot be helped.[2] Finally Aquinas settled the long-mooted question by the positive assertion that suffrages are of no benefit to the damned, and his dictum has since been accepted.[3] The question then arose whether it is lawful to pray for one who has died in mortal sin. Pierre de la Palu says that prayers and suffrages may be offered for him in secret, for he may have secretly repented, but for the avoidance of scandal he cannot have public suffrages such as masses, or be buried in consecrated ground.[4] François de Mayrone goes further and asserts it to be a mortal sin to pray for souls in hell; in this Domingo Soto agrees with him, but more recent authorities do not put it so crudely, though they assume that it is unlawful to do so.[5] In view of the impossibility of accurate knowledge as to the fate of any given soul, it would seem that no prayers can be offered for any one without incurring the risk of sin, but we may presume that invincible ignorance renders the sin merely material.

To return to our more immediate subject, the relief of souls in purgatory, we find that as belief in the latter became more defined, the promise of release through the ministrations of the Church became gradually more assured. Ivo of Chartres seems to entertain no doubt that it will be obtained through the prayers of the faithful, though Honorius of Autun assumes that it is more effective for those who have while living thus aided their predecessors, and Hildebert

[1] Gloss. in Cap. 23 Decret. Caus. XIII. Q. ii.

[2] Hostiens. Aureæ Summæ Lib. v. de Pœnit. et Remiss. § 59.

[3] S. Th. Aquin. Summæ Suppl. Q. LXXI. Art. 5. "Suffragia illis minime prodesse."—S. Antonini Summæ P. III. Tit. xxxii. Cap. 1, § 2.

Yet Thomas of Walden (De Sacramental. Tit. XI. Cap. CVII. n. 4) still holds with St. Augustin that the damned can thus obtain some alleviation.

[4] P. de Palude in IV. Sentt. Dist. XLV. Q. i. ad 2, Concl. 4.—S. Antonini Summæ loc. cit. § 7.

[5] Fr. de Mayrone in IV. Sentt. Dist. XXI. Q. 5, Art. 3.—Dom. Soto in IV. Sentt. Dist. XLV. Q. ii. Art. 2, Concl. 1.—P. Dens Theologia, Tract. de Quatuor Noviss. No. 20.—Gousset, Théologie Dogmatique, II. 161.—Bonal Institt. Theol. II. 338.

of Le Mans only promises absolutely mitigation in case complete release is not obtained.[1] The means to be employed remain the same as of old without additions. Gratian enumerates four—masses, prayers of the saints, alms by friends or fasting by kindred, and this long continued to be the received teaching.[2] Yet it would seem as though the men who were earnestly engaged in framing and establishing the sacramental theory looked somewhat askance on these methods of diminishing the terrors of purgatory as an excrescence which interfered with the completeness of their system. They dwelt on the supreme importance of contrition which remitted the *culpa* in the sacrament and released from hell, leaving the *pœna* of purgatory to be remitted by the satisfaction of penance; the corollary from this was that he who would not purchase immediate admission to heaven on terms so easy did not deserve to have his temporal punishment cancelled by the vicarious satisfaction performed by his kindred. The very name of purgatory meant purgation, or the cauterization of sin by fire, and what purgation was there if a few masses or alms or prayers conferred immunity? Thus Hugh of St. Victor is not advanced beyond St. Augustin, whose utterances he quotes; the pseudo-Augustin makes no allusion to any succor for the dead. Peter Lombard briefly quotes St. Augustin that some help may be had by those who have merited it, adding that no one who neglects this need hope for it; after death the soul deals directly with God and is treated according to its deserts in life; evidently, as far as he dared, he desired to diminish reliance on suffrage. Richard of St. Victor was too earnestly engaged in proving that the perfected sacrament of confession, absolution and satisfaction relieved the soul of both hell and purgatory to waste any time on the succor which the dead could expect from survivors, especially as there can be no true repentance which does not embrace the firm resolve to perform the penance enjoined, and in this injunction the divine sentence is translated into a human one, the nonperformance of which inevitably inflicts eternal damnation.[3]

---

[1] Ivon. Carnotens. Epist. CLXXIV.—Honor. Augustod. Elucidar. Lib. III. Cap. 2.—Hildeberti Cenomanens. Serm. 85.

[2] Cap. 22, Caus. XIII. Q. ii. Cf. Honor. Augustodun. et Hildebertum Cenomanens. *ubi sup.*—Hugonis Rothomagens. Dialogor. Lib. v. Interr. xix.

[3] Hugon. de S. Victore de Sacramentis Lib. II. P. xvi. Cap. 6, 7.—Ps.

Yet the revolution effected by the sacramental theory increased vastly the importance of purgatory as a factor of the future life, and consequently the demand for the observances which should mitigate or shorten its torments. Hitherto the suggestions of St. Augustin and the assertions of Gregory I. that it was only for the expiation of the *minuta peccata*, the trifling sins of overmuch talking, immoderate laughter and the like, had been universally accepted.[1] When, however, the distinction between *culpa* and *pœna* was established and sinners were taught that only the guilt was remitted in the sacrament, while the punishment remained to be endured in purgatory unless expiated by the severe and prolonged canonical penance, and when it became the fashion to diminish or evade the penance and take the chances of purgatory, it was seen that scarce any of the faithful could escape the latter. The pressure for relief from it necessarily became correspondingly greater, and the business of furnishing this relief fully compensated for the abandonment of claims to rescue from hell, which were recognized as impossible under the new theological system. How purely mechanical and business-like it was becoming is seen in the answer of Alain de Lille to the heretics who insisted that the value of suffrages and prayers for the dead depended on the virtue of the officiating priest: he argues that the virtue is in the formula and not in the devotion or purity of the ministrant; it may be a sin for him to perform his functions without zeal or devotion, but they are none the less efficacious for the relief of the suffering soul.[2] Perhaps we need not be surprised that, in the development of this spirit, Dr. Amort should inform us, in the eighteenth century, that the value of prayers for the dead is in proportion to the rank of the person offering them and the amount of his gifts.[3]

Although, by the end of the twelfth century, the use of indulgences was fairly introduced and was developing rapidly, they were reserved for the living. They were recognized as a function of jurisdiction, and the principle was settled that the jurisdiction of the Church is confined to this world and does not extend to the next. S. Ramon de

Augustin. de Vera et Falsa Pœnit. Cap. xviii.—P. Lombardi Sententt. Dist. XLV. §§ 1, 2, 4.—R. de S. Victore de Potestate Ligandi Cap. v. vi. vii. xxiii.

[1] Gratiani Decr. Cap. 4 Dist. XXV.

[2] Alani de Insulis contra Hæreticos Lib. II. Cap. xii.–xiv.

[3] Amort de Indulgent. II. 294.

Peñafort is silent on the subject, as though the idea had not yet been suggested, and not long afterwards his commentator, William of Rennes, expresses disbelief in the extension of indulgences to the dead, as the power of the keys is confined to this world; it is true that the pope or bishops can obligate the Church or the individual churches to pray for souls, and he adds that if the pope, in the plenitude of his power, should issue such an indulgence he would not venture to dispute it.[1] This shows that in the interval the question had been raised, and in effect Alexander Hales, in 1245, speaks of it as exceedingly probable. His theory of the treasure of the Church was prolific and suggested that if the pope would apply it to the living there was no reason why he should not also use it for the benefit of those in purgatory. It is true that he cannot do this judicially or in commutation, but it may reasonably be said that he can do it by way of suffrage and impetration, and Hales shows the tentative nature of this speculation by adding that if the keys had authority over souls in purgatory it would serve to solve the problem.[2] Albertus Magnus sees no reason why indulgences should not be of service to souls in purgatory if they had deserved such relief during life, but he has never seen any grants specially applicable to them, and no man can transfer, either to the living or the dead, an indulgence gained by him.[3] Cardinal Henry of Susa holds that indulgences gained in life help subsequently, while he denies flatly that those granted for souls in purgatory are of any benefit to them. Apparently already the attempt was made to promise a year of indulgence to the soul of the father of anyone who would pay the required "alms," but Cardinal Henry declares that those who thus deceive the people sin greatly, for the power of the keys is of no avail to souls which have passed from the judgment of the Church to that of God.[4] Soon after this Bonaventura adopts the suggestion of Hales; indulgences are only of service to the dead by way of suffrage and can be obtained only by the living performing the enjoined work and transferring it, and in this he is followed by Peter of Tarantaise.[5] Vicarious satisfaction

[1] Postill. super S. Raymundi Summæ Lib. III. Tit. xxxiv. § 5.

[2] Alex. de Ales Summæ P. IV. Q. XXIII. Art. ii. Membr. 5.

[3] Alb. Magni in IV. Sentt. Dist. XX. Artt. 18, 22.

[4] Hostiens. Aureæ Summæ Lib. V. De Remiss. §§ 6, 9.

[5] S. Bonaventuræ in IV. Sentt. Dist. XX. P. ii. Art. 1, Q. 5.—Petri Hieremiæ Quadragesimale, *De Peccato* Serm. XXVII.

was so thoroughly recognized, the application of merits had been so long practised, and the use of suffrages of various kinds was so old a custom that this extension of the use of indulgences might well appear reasonable enough to overcome all scruples as to the limitation of the power of the keys to this world, especially when it was so ingeniously evaded by the substitution of the word "suffrage" for that of "jurisdiction."

Aquinas was not disposed to listen to any such compromises. He boldly argued that there is no reason why the Church cannot transfer the common treasure to the dead as well as the living; a remission in the forum of the Church is good in the forum of God, but prelates must not imagine that they can liberate souls at will, for there must be a sufficient cause for granting indulgences.[1] Thus already there was a dispute between those who admitted indulgences for the dead as to whether they could be granted directly and authoritatively or whether they were merely suffrages offered to God in deprecation—a question which was not settled for two centuries to come. The whole matter in fact was as yet scarce more than an academical one, of no practical importance, for indulgences for the dead were scarce known. It is true that, in 1300, Boniface VIII., at the close of his jubilee, announced that those who had died on the road to Rome gained the indulgence,[2] but this would seem to be regarded rather as a definition than a grant, and it is also true that, in 1310, the bishops assembled at the council of Mainz granted an indulgence of forty days to all buried in their churches, while not long afterwards Pierre de la Palu alludes to such indulgences issued by prelates, which he holds to be strictly within their competence, and that if it is so expressed in the concession anyone who gains an indulgence can apply it to a soul in purgatory,[3] but, on the other hand, the four modes of suffrage enumerated by Gratian continued to be repeated, as though there had been no addition to them, except by Pierre himself, who describes these indulgences as a fifth, and by Dr. Weigel, who tells us that burning candles is of service provided

[1] S. Th. Aquin. in IV. Sentt. Dist. XLV. Q. ii. ad 3; Q. iii. ad 2; Summæ Suppl. Q. XXV. Art. 1; Q. LXX. Art. 10.

[2] Amort de Indulgent. I. 80.

[3] C. Mogunt. ann. 1310 Lib. II. (Hartzheim, IV. 197).—P. de Palude in IV. Sentt. Dist. XX. Q. iv. Art. iii. Concl. 6; Dist. XLV. Q. 1, Art. 3, Concl. 5.

they are offered to God and are otherwise uselessly consumed.[1] If credence may be given to an account of the other world related by a man named Godfrey, who died at Bruchsall in 1321, and revived after six hours, the mass was still regarded as the most efficient aid that can be rendered to a suffering soul.[2] How little disposition there was, indeed, to supersede the time-honored forms of suffrage is manifested by the fourteenth and fifteenth century practice (p. 185) of granting indulgences to those who would pray for the souls of certain magnates. So roundabout a method of relief would not have been asked for or granted had the popes imagined themselves competent to apply the treasure directly as a suffrage for the souls in question.[3] Certain theologians like François de Mayrone had no hesitation in denying such power,[4] and the council of Vienne, in 1312, in its enumeration of the evil practices of the *quæstuarii*, includes their lying promises to extract from purgatory the souls of the kindred of those who buy their indulgences.[5] Evidently none thus applicable had been issued by the Holy See, nor was there any thought that there could be.

The theologians, however, went on discussing and disputing. Pierre de la Palu, as stated above, saw no difficulty in such indulgences even when granted by bishops. Durand de S. Pourçain took the position that souls in purgatory are not *de foro ecclesiæ*, but they can enjoy

---

[1] Hostiens. Aureæ Summæ Lib. v. De Pœn. et Remiss. § 59.—J. Friburgens. Summæ Confessor. Lib. III. Tit. xxxiv. Q. 167.—Fr. de Mayrone in IV. Sentt. Dist. XXI. Art. 3.—Gloss. in Clement. (Steph. ex Nottis Opus Remiss. fol. 156*b*).—Weigel Claviculæ Indulgent. Cap. lxxix.

Of course these modes of suffrage gave rise to innumerable nice questions which need not detain us here. They may be found elaborately discussed by Peter of Palermo, Quadragesimale, *De Peccato* Serm. xxv. xxvi.

[2] Trithem. Annal. Hirsaug. ann. 1321.

[3] When Philippe le Long was dying, in 1322, he asked for the prayers of John XXII. to cleanse his soul, and the pope responded with an indulgence of twenty days to all who should pray for him. Even as late as 1470, on the eve of granting indulgences for the dead, Paul II. gave seven years and seven quarantines to all who should visit the chapel of St. Anthony at Lisbon on the anniversary of Ferdinand, Infante of Portugal, and pray for his soul and those of his sister Isabella of Burgundy and their ancestors.—Amort de Indulg. I. 198, 202.

[4] Fr. de Mayrone in IV. Sentt. Dist. XX. Q. iv. Cf. Dist. XXI. Q. 5.

[5] Cap. 2 § 1 Clement. Lib. v. Tit. ix.

indulgences through suffrage.[1] Bartolommeo da S. Concordio impliedly denies this when he follows the council of Vienne in rebuking the pardoners for their lying promises of liberating souls.[2] Joan Andrea, the greatest canonist of the age, the *Fons canonum* and the *Norma legum*, in commenting on the decree of Alexander III. restricting the indulgences of bishops to those under their jurisdiction, draws the conclusion that indulgences are of no benefit to souls in purgatory, for they are wholly under the jurisdiction of God, but he somewhat irrelevantly adds that the theologians say there is no reason why the treasure cannot be applied to them as well as to the living.[3] William of Montlun, although he quotes Aquinas, asserts definitely that indulgences are of no service to souls in purgatory, for the keys have no power over those who have reached the judgment of God.[4] St. Birgitta seems to know nothing of such indulgences in sundry revelations concerning purgatory and the assistance which the living can render to the dead.[5] At last, however, there commenced a tentative movement to take practical advantage of the vague academic theories that were floating around. The Roman churches were ever conspicuously unscrupulous in assuming and asserting anything that would render them attractive to the oblations of sinners, and the assimilation of indulgences for the dead to suffrages suggested the idea of special benefits derivable from certain altars—an idea which subsequently was developed into the "privileged altars" now forming so large a portion of the machinery for the release of souls. The chapel known as the Scala Cœli rejoiced in the legend which related that St. Bernard, when celebrating there a funeral mass, saw the souls for which he prayed ascending to heaven on a ladder. That there should be claimed for it, therefore, some peculiar advantage, now that indulgential suffrages were in the air, was not unnatural, but the undefined nature of these claims shows how completely uncertain as yet were all the ideas on the subject.

---

[1] Durandi de S. Porciano in IV. Sentt. Dist. XX. Q. iv. § 11.

[2] Summa Pisanella s. v. *Quæstuarii* n. 3.

[3] Gloss. in C. 4 Extra Lib. v. Tit. xxxviii. (Steph. ex Nottis Opus Remiss. fol. 148*a*).

[4] Guill. de Monte Lauduno, De Indulgentiis Q. 9.—"Sed nec illis qui sunt in purgatorio prosunt quia cum fiunt et procedunt virtute clavium et clavis non liget vel absolvat mortuos qui sunt relicti divino judicio."

[5] S. Birgittæ Revelat. Lib. IV. Cap. 7, 9; Lib. VI. Cap. 52; Lib. VII. Cap. 14.

According to the 1370 MS. of the "Stacions of Rome," it was the only church in Rome that asserted any especial privilege, and this was of the vaguest description, though the number of popes alleged as granting it shows that its importance was magnified to the utmost.

> Heore soules in heuene for to come
> There men may helpe, quike and dede
> As the clerkes in bokes rede
> Foure and fourti popes granted than
> That liggen at seint Sebastian.
> Pope Urban, Siluestre and Benet
> Leon, Clement confermede hit.[1]

The active minds that were exploiting the Portiuncula were not behindhand in making claims that their indulgence was as efficient for the dead as for the living, and Bartolommeo da Pisa soon after this asserts that one of its special advantages is that it can be taken by the living, and when applied to the dead it liberates them at once from purgatory—a fact which he proves by abundant miracles.[2]

---

[1] Early English Text Society, p. 5 (1867). In the fifteenth century recension this had greatly developed, but so crude were still the conceptions on the subject that it claimed to release from both hell and purgatory, showing that it was self-asserted and unauthorized—

> Ther men may helpe bothe qwykke and dede,
> As clerkes yn her bokes rede;
> Whó-so syngeth masse yn that chappelle
> For any frend he loseth hym fro helle,
> He may hym brynge thorow purgatory y-wys
> In to the blys of paradys.
> Ther sowles abyde tylle domis day
> In myche ioye as y you say.—Ibid. p. 119.

In the final prose version of about 1460–70, this extravagance is toned down. "He that sayeth a masse ther with good devossyon may brynge a soule out of pulcatorry to heyvyn and gretly helpe hys frende that is alyve, and iii M. yere of pardon ys granted by popys xlvii that liue at sent sebestyande."—Early English Text Soc. 1867, pp. 31–2.

[2] Lib. Conformitatum Ed. 1513, fol. 136, 139. I have already alluded (p. 243) to the contempt with which Cardinal Bonifazio de' Amanati treats this claim in his commentary on the Clementines, likening it to the abuses denounced in the council of Vienne. He relates that when there he passed through the little church as often as he chose, applying the indulgence each time to a soul in purgatory, including a mistress whom he had kept when a student at Padua. He evidently regarded the whole matter as a joke.—J. B. Thiers, Traité des Superstitions, T. IV. p. 259.

Still the general question whether such indulgences are possible remained undecided. Cardinal Zabarella quotes Henry of Susa and others on the one side and Aquinas and his followers on the other, and leaves it open.[1] It is not alluded to by Huss in his assaults on indulgences, and an anonymous tract in refutation of the Hussite Jacobel of Mies, in rehearsing the virtues of indulgences, says nothing about it,[2] showing that it was of no practical importance and had attracted no public attention. Gerson reflects the uncertain condition of opinion at this time; in one passage he denies that such indulgences can be granted; in another he says that the opinions on each side are equally probable, and in a third he admits that the power of the keys can extend to purgatory indirectly, in view of the communion of saints in the creed.[3] Even when Eugenius IV. and the council of Bâle were issuing rival indulgences to raise money to carry on their competition for the Greek envoys, neither of them thought of having recourse to this attraction, and when, in 1439, the council of Florence presented to the Greeks a formula on purgatory, it mentioned as aids to the souls there only the old enumeration of masses, prayers and almsgiving.[4] In 1441 Dr. Weigel still cites the authorities on both sides, and, like Cardinal Zabarella, avoids a decision,[5] while Peter of Palermo asserts resolutely that the pope can grant indulgences directly to souls in purgatory as a matter of jurisdiction, but this power is reserved to the pope alone —even the Virgin and the angels cannot exercise it.[6] John of Imola, on the other hand, recurs to the old theory that the whole subject is

---

[1] Steph. ex Nottis Opus Remissionis fol. 155*b*.

[2] Von der Hardt, Concil. Constant. T. III. pp. 685–90.

[3] Jo. Gersonis Serm. II. pro Defunctis (Ed. 1488 LX. B); Opusc. de Indulgent. Consid. XI.; De Absolutione defuncti Carthusianens. (XXXIII. M).

At the end of the *Opusc. de Indulgentiis* there are some verses—

> Arbitrio Papæ proprio si clavibus uti
> Possit, cur sinit ut pœna pios cruciet?
> Cur non evacuat loca purgandis animabus
> Tradita? Sed servus esse fidelis amat . . .
> Carus in Ecclesia thesaurus et utilis assit,
> Quem dat larga manus prodiga crimen habet (XXXIV. D).

[4] C. Florent. ann. 1439 (Harduin. IX. 985).

[5] Weigel Claviculæ Indulgent. Cap. lix.

[6] Pet. Hieremiæ Quadragesimale, *De Peccato*, Serm. XXVIII.

based on the lies of the quæstuarii, and though he quotes the authorities on either side he concludes in the negative,[1] while Felix Hemmerlin, in his treatise preparatory to the jubilee of 1450, asserts confidently that the pope has power over the souls of the living and of the dead in purgatory, without drawing any distinction between them.[2]

The matter had thus been in debate for more than two centuries, and no decision had yet been reached, but the final result was inevitable. However long the Church might hesitate to transcend the grant of the keys which were admitted to be confined to earth, and to regulate the destinies of the souls which it had always said had passed to the judgment seat of God, it could not be expected always to reject the power which the schoolmen asserted to belong to it and to abstain from reaping the harvest promised by that extension of power. The frauds of the quæstuarii had produced a demand for indulgences for the dead, and such a demand would not fail in time to produce a supply. St. Antonino, whose authority was of the greatest, treats the subject repeatedly in a manner to show that it was attracting a constantly increased attention; he admits that some denied the power; he asserts positively that the pope has authority to grant indulgences for purgatory, but denies that he can so exercise it as to release all the souls confined there: the concession, however, must specifically declare that it is so applicable, for no one can gain an ordinary indulgence and apply it to the dead.[3] About this time, moreover, another Roman church, San Giovanni di Porta Latina, asserted that on St. John's day its altar had the power of liberating a soul,[4] and there are

---

[1] Steph. ex Nottis Opus Remissionis fol. 156.

[2] Et potest vivis et defunctis, saltem degentibus in purgatorio, remissionis peccatorum gratiam impertiri.—Fel. Hemmerlin Dyalogus de anno jubileo, p 3 (Ed. 1497).

[3] S. Antonini Summæ P. I. Tit. x. Cap. 3; P. III. Tit. xxii. Cap. 1 § 1; Cap. 5 § 6.

[4] Stacions of Rome, MS. circa 1450, p. 122—

> At seynt John the porte latyn
> Is a chapelle fayr and fyne;
> At the feste of his day
> A sowle fro purgatorye wynne thou may.

The 1370 text has no reference to this church, and neither has the later prose version. The claim was probably one that attracted no attention and was abandoned.

several papal indulgences for the dead of this period which I think can be safely rejected as fictitious.[1] Not long afterward the church of St. Praxeda, in Rome, displayed a tablet at the entrance of a chapel containing the pillar at which Christ was scourged, bearing the inscription that Pope Paschasius V. granted plenary remission, in the way of suffrage, to any soul in purgatory for which anyone should celebrate or cause to be celebrated five masses in it; that Paschasius, after celebrating the fifth mass for the soul of a nephew, saw through the window in front of the altar the Virgin extracting the said soul from purgatory, and further that eleven popes had confirmed the indulgence.[2] The novelty and boldness of this excited much attention,

[1] The Hospital of S. Spirito in Saxia claimed to have an indulgence for the dead granted in 1447 by Nicholas V., which was confirmed by Leo X. Such an innovation would have attracted attention and could not have been passed over in silence by the writers of the period, while the earliest reference to it is in 1516, in the *Chronicon Curiæ* of Widemann (Menkenii Script. German. III. 735–7). For the same reason I doubt the accuracy of Voight who says (v. Raumer's Historisches Taschenbuch, 1833, p. 141) that in 1451 Nicholas of Cusa, in publishing the jubilee of 1450 in Germany, offered indulgences for the dead as well as for the living. The same argument applies to a similar indulgence said to have been granted by Calixtus III. (1455–58) to the cathedral of Taragona, and besides, had such grant been made it would not have escaped the researches of the editors of the *España Sagrada*, Tom. 49, 50. We shall see how great was the discussion raised when Sixtus IV., in 1476, really made such a concession to the church of Xaintes.

[2] This account is given in the instructions issued by the church of Xaintes in 1482, of which more hereafter. It is also quoted by Gabriel Biel (in IV. Sentt. Dist. XLV. Q. iii. Art. 2), who states that Cardinal Raymond Perauld had it printed and circulated throughout Europe in 1500 to remove the doubts as to the indulgence for the dead in the jubilee of Alexander VI. Jean le Maire (in IV. Sentt. Dist. XX. Q. ii. *ap.* Amort de Indulg. II. 126) also alludes to it in connection with a discussion on the subject by the Sorbonne about the same time.

All these contemporaries agree in ascribing the indulgence and the miracle to Paschasius V. As there never was a pope of that name, the blunder of the fabricator is evaded by modern authorities by attributing to Biel a mistake in the name, and by asserting that the real pope was Paschal I. (Bellarmini de Indulg. Lib. I. Cap. 14.—Jouhanneaud, Dict. des Indulgences, p. 329), to whom they ascribe therefore the invention of privileged altars. As Paschal I. was pope from 817 to 824, of course the substitute is as impossible as his imaginary prototype.

The tablet must have been displayed at St. Praxeda only a short time previous to its use by the church of Xaintes as a proof of indulgences for the dead.

and several other churches speedily followed the example. San Lorenzo *fuor le mura* hung up a double bull before the high altar under which reposed the relics of St. Lawrence and of St. Stephen protomartyr, announcing that two popes granted by way of suffrage to anyone who would visit devoutly that altar on a Thursday, the release from purgatory of a soul; St. Sebastian *extra urbem* promised the same for those celebrating or causing to be celebrated a mass for a soul, and a similar promise was made in the chapel where St. Peter celebrated his first mass in Rome.[1]

All these are so evidently fabrications that their only value is to indicate the tendency of the time to extend the function of indulgences to the dead and the keen desire felt to discover some new and profitable field of operations. The first authentic response to this is found in a grant by Sixtus IV. in 1476 to the church of Xaintes. Why this recipient of the favor was chosen was probably because the Cardinal of San Grisostomo had obtained a valuable benefice in that church, while the mention of Raymond Perauld, the papal commissioner, and of papal collectors shows that the curia shared in the profits. The bull of concession granted, by way of suffrage, plenary remission from purgatory to the souls for which kindred or friends would

---

There is no allusion to it in any of the recensions of the "Stacions of Rome." In the earliest one, St. Praxeda had less indulgences than most of the Roman churches—

> Ther be graunted to everi man
> A thousend yere to pardoun
> And thridde part thi sinnes remissioun (*Ubi sup.* p. 18).

In the second recension we find that St. Praxeda had grasped a plenary for Lammas day, and also one of a year and forty days with one-fourth of sins, but the general indulgence had fallen to five hundred years (Ib. p. 139). In the condensed prose version of 1360–70 all that is said is "At sent praxsede the iiii. parte of synnys ys foregeyff" (*ubi sup.* p. 33). Evidently up to this time it was far behind its competitors, and the need of some new attraction must have been keenly felt. It was a cardinalate church, and Giovanni Colonna, who bore its title, about 1220 brought from Palestine and set up in it the pillar of scourging (Ciacconius, II. 58).

[1] All these are duly recited in the instructions of the church of Xaintes, and Biel tells us (*loc cit.*) that they were in the circular disseminated by Cardinal Perauld in 1500. Perauld had been papal commissioner, in 1482, to superintend the working of the indulgence granted to Xaintes, and doubtless furnished all this material.

pay a fixed sum to the church of Xaintes or to the papal collectors.[1] A grant so novel and unprecedented aroused an earnest discussion, and was so little understood that, in 1477, Sixtus was obliged to issue another bull reciting that he had granted an indulgence for the dead *per modum suffragii*, which had given rise to many scandals and abuses, and that many errors had been preached to the effect that it rendered all the old methods of suffrage superfluous; to counteract this he had written to the bishops to explain that it had not been issued to prevent the faithful from offering the customary suffrages, but to relieve souls in purgatory, to which end it served in the same way as the others. Then, again, to his great disgust and indignation, the bishops proclaimed, on the strength of this, that the indulgence was no better than prayers and alms; for this he rates them soundly, he explains that prayers and alms differ greatly from indulgences *per modum suffragii;* he had only meant that they both operated in the same manner and that the latter supplied what was lacking in the former, and in this sense he ordered the indulgence to be accepted.[2]

This exhibits to us the inevitable antagonism which immediately sprang up when the officiating priests everywhere saw one of their main sources of revenue threatened by this new intruder, which promised to perform more effectually what for centuries had been their lucrative and exclusive privilege in celebrating masses for the dead. Sixtus evidently saw that he had a narrow path to tread, and in his equivocating bull he endeavored in a confused way to soothe the clergy by representing the old and the new as mutually complementary. The clergy might well feel alarmed, for the preachers employed by the church of Xaintes had been little scrupulous in their eagerness to dispose of the indulgence and had not hesitated

[1] As the earliest indulgence of this kind, the bull has a special interest. The clause concerning souls in purgatory will be found in the Appendix, as given in the tract issued by the church of Xaintes.

[2] Sixti PP. IV. Bull. *Romani Pontificis*, 27 Nov. 1477. Amort (II. 292) prints this bull from the Cathedral Library at Augsburg. It is also included in a manifesto or prospectus of the indulgence issued by the church of Xaintes in 1482. I have a copy of this extremely scarce production, without date or place of impression. It is a folio of thirty-four unnumbered pages and consists of two parts—the first a collection of opinions and documents, the second a *Summarium* of the Indulgence or instructions for the preachers and quæstuarii sent out to publish it to the faithful. As one of the rarest of the incunabula, I present considerable extracts from it in the Appendix.

to make promises which rendered all the older suffrages unnecessary. They declared that no matter how long a soul had to suffer in purgatory it would at once fly to heaven as soon as six *blancs* were given for it as suffrage in alms for the repair of the church of Xaintes. Although Sixtus, in his bull of 1477, might repudiate any such interpretation of his grant, the preachers continued to give these assurances, and in 1482 the Sorbonne felt obliged formally to condemn them as not to be absolutely affirmed and as not warranted by the bull nor safely to be preached to the people.[1]

It can readily be understood that the innovation excited much discussion and provoked many doubts. The subject had hitherto been confined to the schools, and even there theologians had not been able to reach an unanimous conclusion in favor of the power thus assumed. To the people it was a novelty which could not be at once accepted, even on the authority of the Holy See. The beneficiary of the grant therefore was obliged to use every means to overcome popular incredulity and clerical opposition. It sought the opinions of learned doctors in its favor and accumulated all the evidences and precedents that it could find, and printed them for the edification of the community, to prove that the pope had the power which he had assumed, and in this it relied largely on the forged bull of Clement VI., purporting to have been issued in 1346, in which he commanded angels to extract from purgatory the souls of pilgrims who should die on the road to his jubilee (see p. 203). In the Appendix will be found the salient points of one of the opinions,

---

[1] D'Argentré, I. II. 307. "Talis propositio non est simpliciter, absolute et catholice asserenda, nec ex tenore bullæ seu virtute indulgentiarum prædictæ ecclesiæ S. Petri Xantonensis concessarum, sane nec secure populo quovis modo prædicanda."

The *grand blanc* was a trifle less than one-third of a *gros tournois*, and as there were ten *gros* to a florin, the price of liberation of a soul was about one-fifth of a florin.

In spite of this condemnation the Sorbonne was obliged, in 1516, to repeat it more emphatically when the preachers of the *croisade* in Paris declared that as soon as a *teston* (12 sous tournois) was deposited in the chest the soul would infallibly fly to paradise, and that for a thousand *testons* a thousand souls would be thus liberated.—D'Argentré, I. II. 355.

In Germany at the same period there was attributed to Tetzel the doggerel rhyme—

So bald das Geld im Kasten klinget
So bald sich die Seele in Himmel schwinget.

given by Dr. Johannes de Fabrica, who proves the validity of the indulgence by the illimitable power of the papacy, which no one must oppose or question; the pope not only has the right to assist souls in purgatory by way of suffrage, but direct jurisdiction to relieve them of their torments. There is another and longer argument by Master Nicholas Richard, who points out that an ordinary indulgence cannot be transferred to the dead, but it can be if it embodies a provision to that effect. He argues that souls in purgatory are still on earth and subject to papal jurisdiction; he also proves that the pope, as the sole custodian of the treasure, can grant indulgences by way of suffrage, shifting from one to the other as though his object was to confuse the question, and he warns the people not rashly to doubt the judgment and power of the pope, for in the one way or the other he can effect it; this suffices, and to question it is sacrilege. To soothe the jealous alarm of the priests he assures them that indulgences need not supersede the ordinary suffrages, for the latter, if unnecessary for souls in purgatory, will redound to the temporal and spiritual benefit of the giver. He discusses also a curious question, which shows how many interests were affected by the innovation—whether, when a man left a bequest for masses for his soul and an indulgence was procured for him, the bequest should still be paid, and this he decides in the affirmative for many reasons, among others that, although he would already be in paradise, his joys would be increased by the masses.

This is followed by a collection of bulls, including the forged one of Clement VI., and extracts from Gerson and St. Antonino, showing how much material was deemed necessary to convince the people of the validity of this novel exercise of papal authority. Finally we have the instructions for the guidance of the preachers of the indulgence—or rather indulgences, for the liberality of Pope Sixtus had bestowed on the church of Xaintes graces for both the living and the dead. This document sheds so much light on the business as conducted at this period that I have inserted the more important sections in the Appendix. It enumerates the four graces conferred on the church and offered for the liberality of the pious. First, there is a jubilee, equal to that obtainable by a pilgrimage to Rome. Second, there is a faculty to confessors to absolve for all papal reserved cases and to grant plenary indulgence as often as the sinner thinks himself in danger of death. Third and chief is the jubilee for souls

in purgatory, and fourth, is participation offered to both living and dead in all the suffrages, prayers and good works of the Church Universal. All these are set forth in the most alluring terms, and their superior and unprecedented advantages are fervently described. Allusion is made to the opposition excited by the high prices asked for these benefits, especially as confessional letters have recently been sold everywhere for whatever purchasers were willing to give for them, the chaffering over which was a scandal and disgrace to the Church, and the faithful are assured that for the present one no abatement will be made. Moreover, it is explained that these letters are much more desirable than the former ones—better indeed than those customarily sold in Rome for three florins. As to the objection urged that the poor are thus deprived of the benefits offered, the reply to be made is that the condition of the poor is worse in many other respects than that of the rich, and it is better that they should thus suffer than that the treasure of the Church should be vilipended —besides, the commissioners are empowered to use discretion in some cases.[1] The indulgence for souls in purgatory evidently gave to the framers of the instructions considerable trouble from the necessity of finding answers to the doubt and wonder which its novelty had excited, the incredulity as to its validity and the disposition existing to consider an indulgence *per modum suffragii* as no better than the customary suffrages of the Church. There is a long and labored disquisition to confuse the matter, to prove that the popes have direct jurisdiction over purgatory, and to convey the impression that the term "suffrage" means nothing. Finally the instructions conclude with an extract from the fictitious bull of Clement VI., ordering the angels to conduct souls from purgatory, and to this the attention of preachers is specially directed.

I have dwelt thus at length on this indulgence because it was the first authentic assertion by the Holy See of power over purgatory, a power which has borne such abundant fruits, and which marks so great an advance in the spiritual attributes of the papacy. Some writers have sought to extenuate it by arguing, as did the clergy of

---

[1] A less brutal argument than this, as to the advantage which the rich have over the poor through indulgences is "And very fit they should; having so many disadvantages and running so many hazards from their Wealth other waies."—The Roman Doctrine of Repentance and of Indulgences vindicated from Dr. Stillingfleet's Misrepresentations, p. 63 (London, 1672).

Xaintes, that it in fact was nothing but the time-honored custom of offering suffrages for the dead, in view of the fact that Sixtus, in adopting the formula *per modum suffragii*, settled the academic discussion whether such indulgences could be granted as a matter of jurisdiction or of suffrage. Dr. Amort is virtually of this opinion, arguing that the Church has always prayed for the dead; if, at the end of the fifteenth century, it operated in a new manner, and if the new method is more efficacious and certain than the old, there was cruelty in not using it for fifteen centuries; now the Church cannot be said to have been ignorant of its power or to have been cruel; it cannot have left the souls of the faithful to languish in purgatory when it could have relieved them, and therefore its present method must be merely the same as its former one.[1]

In spite of the repeated bulls of Sixtus and of the efforts of the beneficiaries of Xaintes the new indulgences for the dead did not meet with universal acceptance. Angiolo da Chivasso admits theoretically the papal power to issue them as suffrage, but to him it is still evidently only an academic question. Baptista Tornamala equivocates and shuffles the matter aside.[2] Gabriel Biel argued against it in his Exposition of the Mass, but on being shown, about 1485, the bull of Sixtus IV., and that Innocent VIII. soon afterwards extended the indulgence to the crusade against the Turks, he yielded assent, and added an appendix to his book, in which he showed his dialectic skill by disproving his previous arguments; but he still maintained that the traditional suffrages are indispensable, since the validity of indulgences depends on God's approval of the causes for which they are issued, and if the keys err by granting them with simoniacal or avaricious intent they are inefficient.[3] After the papal power had once been asserted, however, to call it in question was dangerous, and there was scant hesitation in enforcing unanimity of opinion. The denial of it was one of the heresies

---

[1] Amort de Indulgent. II. 291.

[2] Summa Angelica s. vv. *Indulgentia* § 21, *Purgatorium*, *Suffragia*.—Summa Rosella s. vv. *Indulgentia* § 14, *Suffragium*.

[3] Gab. Biel Expositio Missæ Lect. 57 (Ed. 1515 fol. 153–55).—"Sed dubium esse posset an causa indulgentiarum sit ea quam Deus approbat: an conferentis intentio sana sit et integra et non subdola ex simoniæ vitio vel avariciæ procedens, quæ licet non sint facile præsumenda, non tamen sunt undequaque certa, nam, clave errante, potestas clavium debita caret efficacia."

which Pedro de Osma was forced to recant in 1478,[1] and even more severe was the treatment of Dr. Dietrich Möhring, a canon of Bamberg, Würtzburg, and Eichstadt, in 1489, when Raymond Perauld came as papal commissioner to preach a jubilee with indulgences for the dead. He asserted that such indulgences could only be granted as suffrage, whereupon the commissioner flung him in gaol, where he lay for nine years.[2]

When Alexander VI. published his jubilee of 1500 he did not neglect this fresh source of profit. As usual, no "alms" were required of pilgrims seeking the indulgence for themselves, but he announced that there would be a chest placed in St. Peter's, where the penitentiaries were empowered to grant plenary indulgences by way of suffrage to all souls in purgatory on the deposit in the chest of such sums as they might designate, giving as a reason for this the suffering of the souls arising from the suspension of all other indulgences which he had ordered.[3] It was the same when he extended the jubilee elsewhere, and we have seen how, to overcome the incredulity which still prevailed as to the validity of indulgences for the dead, Raymond Perauld, by this time a cardinal, printed and circulated an account of the privileged altars in St. Praxeda and other Roman churches.

Julius II. was not likely to overlook this resource when, to raise money for the gigantic structure of St. Peter's, he issued, in 1510, the celebrated bull *Liquet Omnibus*, which finally aroused the opposition of Luther. In this the *plenissima* indulgence by way of suffrage for souls in purgatory is promised to all who will pay the amount determined by the commissioners. Participation in the good works of the Church Universal is further promised to all who will stretch forth a helping hand to the fabric, and, curiously enough, when Albert of Mainz, in 1517, undertook to farm out this bull, the indulgence promised for the dead is only this participation,

---

[1] Sixti PP. IV. Bull. *Licet ea*, § 3 (Bullar. I. 417).

[2] Linturii Append. ad Rolewinck ann. 1489 (Pistorii Rer. Germ Scriptt. II. 578).—Widemanni Chron. Curiæ ann. 1489 (Menkenii III. 722–3).

[3] Alex. PP. VI. Bull. *Inter curas multiplices* (Bullar. Vatican. III. 321.—Steph. ex Nottis Opus Remissionis fol. 160). So, in a sermon preached on Ash Wednesday, 1500, before Alexander VI. by Gaspár Pou, indulgences for the dead are spoken of as granted by way of suffrage.—Oratio Gasparis Pou, s. l. e. a (sed Romæ, 1500).

showing how crude and uncertain as yet were the conceptions of the whole subject.[1] In Rome, however, by this time the matter was beginning to be pretty well understood, and indulgences for the dead were becoming part of the recognized resources of the curia. In 1512 Leo X. granted to the Benedictine Congregation of St. Justina that any one celebrating three masses on an altar, to be designated by the prior of a house, for the soul of a kinsman within the third degree, should liberate it as though the masses had been sung at the altar of St. Gregory or St. Sebastian.[2] In 1515 we hear of various privileged altars in Spain and Naples, and Leo conceded an indulgence to the Roman Hospital of the Savior, in which there is a clause granting unconditional release from purgatory, by way of suffrage, to all souls for whom alms are given to the Hospital. There is no expression of doubt and no condition that it shall depend on the good pleasure of God.[3]

Luther naturally did not neglect this comparatively weak spot in the enemy's line. It was a theory which he could deny without denying purgatory or the efficacy of good works for the souls languishing there, and in 1518, while he yet considered himself to be within the Church, he expressed his disbelief in it as a recent doctrine, which had never been proved or authoritatively sanctioned, and he declared that the old methods of prayer and pious works were more certain. Tetzel, in reply, contented himself with referring to the privileged altars in Rome and elsewhere and to the infallibility of the Holy See which had granted such indulgences, while the opinions of Aquinas and other doctors in their favor had never been condemned.[4] A more authoritative champion entered the lists about the same time in Cardinal Caietano, who expressly disclaimed for the papacy any jurisdiction over souls in purgatory; they are wholly subject to the pleasure of God; the pope can only offer to help them from the treasure, confiding that the divine mercy will accept what is offered; it is not all souls that can be thus relieved, but only those which in life showed special submission to the keys and zeal in aid-

[1] Julii PP. II. Bull. *Liquet omnibus* (Bullar. I. 502).—Amort de Indulg. I. 210.

[2] Amort de Indulg. I. 214.

[3] Hergenröther, Regest. Leon. PP. X. n. 6572, 14248, 14275, 16800, 17062.

[4] Lutheri Concio de Indulgent. n. 19 (Opp. I. 124).—Tetzel's Vorlegung, XVIII. (Gröne, Tetzel u. Luther, p. 231).

ing those which had gone before; besides the offer for each soul must be acceptable to God. Thus while indulgences for the living are infallible, those for the dead are uncertain, and the Church is not responsible for the errors which the preachers of indulgences may utter through greed.[1] Leo X., whose growing laxity on the subject is manifested by a grant about this time to the Observantine Franciscans, under which any friar could liberate a soul on Palm Sunday, the feast of St. John (Dec. 27) and of St. John ante Portam Latinam (May 6) by simply reciting before the altar the penitential psalms or five Paters and Aves[2]—Leo X. was not disposed to admit these limitations and distinctions, and in his epistle addressed to Caietano, November 9, 1518, which contains the first authoritative definition on the subject, he only admits that the indulgence to the living is direct absolution, while the application to the dead is *per modum suffragii*, without recognizing that there is any difference as to their efficacy.[3] It is somewhat curious that, two years after this, the learned Jacobus Latomus, in defending the condemnation of Luther's heresies by his university of Louvain, seems to regard the question as still unsettled and defines the indulgence by way of suffrage as merely a supplication, an opinion which, he says, he holds subject to the determination of the Church.[4] Even more significant is the fact that Adrian VI., in his Disputations on the Fourth Book of the Sentences, printed in 1522 (though doubtless written long before), while debating keenly the intricate questions relating to indulgences, is silent as to their application to souls in purgatory.[5] Eight years later Berthold of Chiemsee is cautiously non-committal; we know nothing of what is done with the souls in purgatory, but we are allowed to hope that if the work enjoined by the indulgence is performed it will aid in lightening or removing the punishment assigned to them.[6]

[1] Caietani Tract. XVI. De Indulg. Q. 5.

[2] Amort de Indulgent. I. 158.

[3] Leo. PP. X. Epist. *Cum postquam*, 9 Nov. 1518 (Le Plat, Monum. C. Trident. II. 23). "Sive in hoc vita sint, sive in purgatorio, indulgentias ex superabundantia meritorum Christi et sanctorum, ac tam pro vivis quam pro defunctis, apostolica auctoritate indulgentiam concedendo, thesaurum meritorum Christi et sanctorum dispensare, per modum absolutionis indulgentiam ipsam conferre, vel per modum suffragii illam transferre, consuevisse."

[4] Jac. Latomi adv. Hæreses Art. VII.

[5] Adriani PP. VI. Disput. in IV. Sentt. fol. clviii.–clxv.

[6] Bertoldi Chiemens. Theologiæ Cap. 83, n. 9, 10; Cap. 89, n. 2.

It was possibly in view of the discussion aroused on the subject and the desire to avoid the attacks of the heretics that Clement VII. did not make his jubilee of 1525 applicable to the dead.[1] A more remarkable feature, however, in the development of the doctrine is the fact that the council of Trent is entirely silent on the subject, and does not even include indulgences among the means by which the living can assist the dead.[2] Soon after this Miguel Medina tells us that there were still good and learned Catholics who could not recognize the efficacy of indulgences for souls in purgatory. They argued that the powers to bind and to loose are correlative, and as the pope cannot bind the souls of the dead so he cannot loose them, and they quoted the decree of the council of Vienne denouncing the lies of the pardoners.[3] Even Azpilcueta only admits that there is a valid presumption that the pope grants such indulgences by way of suffrage.[4] Whatever doubts and scruples might be entertained by individual theologians, the Church at large by this time was fully committed to the doctrine, and the popes felt no misgivings as to their own power. It might seem incredible that a human being can persuade himself that he wields such authority, but there can be no reasonable doubt that the conviction is honestly entertained. How limitless and arbitrary it is may be estimated from the fact, semi-officially related by Cardinal Valerio, that, during the jubilee of 1600, the *Società de' Suffragj*, formed to aid souls in purgatory, marched, on October 1, 25,000 strong to the four churches. Clement VIII. met them on the way and was so affected by the sight that on the spot he empowered each of them, and all who would accompany them, to release a soul.[5] It is scarce worth while to follow further in detail this portion of our subject. The irresistible tendency to multiply and facilitate indulgences showed itself in this as in those for the living, and now all those collected in the *Raccolta* are applicable to the dead. This is perhaps natural, in view of the popular teaching that God is impotent to release souls from purgatory before their

[1] Raynald. ann. 1525, n. 2.

[2] C. Trident. Sess. XXV. Decr. de Purgatorio.

[3] Mich. Medinæ Disp. de Indulgent. Cap. XXXII.—"Sed quosdam etiam Catholicos et alioque doctos viros acerrime torsit, dum qua ratione ecclesiastica potestas in corpore jam exutas animas extendatur non satis percipiunt."

[4] Azpilcuetæ de Jubilæo Notab. XXII. § 33.

[5] Valerius de Sacro Anno 1600, p. lxxvi.

allotted time without the aid of man—perhaps the most significant indication of the degree to which the Church has succeeded to the functions of the Almighty.[1]

In view of this extension of the papal power, the question has naturally arisen whether the pope can, by the exercise of his authority, empty purgatory. As a subject about which the disputants cannot possibly know anything, it has had a strong attraction for theologians whose opinions in general are none the less positive because of their ignorance, and few have had the caution of Agostino da Ancona, who admits that he does not know and doubts whether anyone, even the pope himself, does know.[2] Astesanus answers the question, why, if the pope has the power, he does not empty purgatory at a word, by saying that as God's minister he must exercise his power discreetly, otherwise God will not accept his acts.[3] St. Antonino denies the papal ability on the similar ground that such exercise of his power would be irrational and indiscreet.[4] In 1483, when a zealous Franciscan preached that souls in purgatory were under the jurisdiction of the pope, who could release them all at will, the Sorbonne condemned it as dubious in itself, scandalous, and on no account to be taught to the people.[5] In an Ash Wednesday jubilee sermon preached, in 1500,

---

[1] "On peut dire qu'envers les âmes du Purgatoire Dieu se trouve dans un état violent. Dieu aime ces âmes comme un père et il ne peut leur faire aucun bien. Il les voit pleines de mérite, et il ne peut encore les récompenser; il reconnaît en elles ses épouses, et il est forcé de les frapper. Son amour est comme un torrent pret à leur inonder, mais arreté par l'obstacle d'un péché non expié. Nous pouvons lever cet obstacle et faire cesser cette violence par nos satisfactions."—Pieux Commerce des Vivants avec les Morts, p. 13.

The "Bibliothéque Catholique de l'Hopital Militaire de Toulouse," to which this little tract belongs, was blessed by Pius IX., May 1, 1862.

The same view is presented by Père Gay, Neuvaine en l'Honneur des Âmes du Purgatoire, pp. 53–4.

When Ricci, at the synod of Pistoja, denounced as chimerical the application of indulgences to the dead, Pius VI. condemned this opinion as false, rash, offensive to pious ears, insulting to the popes and to the practice and sense of the Church Universal, and leading to the error condemned in Pedro de Osma and Luther.—Bull. *Auctorem fidei* Prop. 42.

[2] Aug. de Ancona Lib. de Potestate Ecclesiæ Q. XXII. Art. iii. (Amort de Indulg. II. 76).

[3] Astesani Summæ Lib. v. Tit. xl. Art. 4, Q. 6.

[4] S. Antonini Summæ P. I. Tit. x. Cap. 3 § 2; P. III. Tit. xxii. Cap. 5, § 6.

[5] D'Argentré, I. II. 305.

before Alexander VI. by Gaspár Pou, professor of theology and apostolic prothonotary and penitentiary, the preacher prudently declines to discuss the question whether his master can empty purgatory, and leaves it for those more learned than himself.[1] When Luther used the power to empty purgatory as an *argumentum ad absurdum* against all indulgences for the dead, Ambrogio Catarino admitted its force by replying that the pope could not do so, because indulgences without just cause are invalid.[2] With the introduction and spread of these indulgences, however, theologians were becoming more inclined to laxity. Prierias and Bartolommeo Fumo argue that the papal power is illimitable over both earth and purgatory, and that he could empty the latter if anyone would do what he prescribed for such purpose, but he would sin in making such indiscreet concession ; and this is the sense in which doctors have denied him the power.[3] Miguel Medina inferentially admits the power when he replies to the taunts of the heretics that to do so would not be consistent with the example of Christ.[4] Bellarmine is more conservative ; the pope cannot arbitrarily empty purgatory, for the benefit of the souls and the glory accruing to God from their liberation would not be adequate cause.[5] Polacchi hedges somewhat by asserting that the power of the pope and the treasure at his disposal are both sufficient, but the exercise of it is an impossibility, for a sufficient cause is required and works must be duly performed by the living.[6] The commentators on the *cruzada* were loyally disposed to exaggerate as far as possible the potency of their wares, and Nogueira informs us that they are unanimous in asserting the papal power.[7] Modern theologians are more moderate. Ferraris denies the power because there can be no rational cause for such a concession, and Palmieri asserts that no one now concedes that the pope can empty purgatory at his discretion.[8] Yet

[1] Oratio habita Romæ Anno Jubilæi MCCCCC in die cinerum coram Alexandro Sexto Pontifice per Gasparem Pou Ilerdensem. s. l. e. a. (sed Romæ, 1500).

[2] Ambr. Catarini adv. Lutheri Dogmata Lib. III. (Florentiæ, 1520, fol. 75*b*).

[3] Summa Sylvestrina s. v. *Papa*, § 6.—Aurea Armilla s. v. *Papa*, § 11.

[4] Mich. Medina Disputat. de Indulgent. Cap. 36.

[5] Bellarmini de Indulg. Lib. I. Cap. xiv.

[6] Polacci Comment. in Bull. Urbani PP. VIII. p. 112.

[7] Nogueira Expositio Bullæ Cruciatæ, Ed. Colon. 1744, p. 525.

[8] Ferraris Prompta Bibl. s. v. *Indulgentia*, Art. II. n. 32.—Palmieri Tract. de Indulg. p. 479.

Leo XIII. nearly accomplished this when, as one of the incidents of his jubilee in 1888, he ordered for the last Sunday in September a mass in commemoration of all the faithful dead, when every altar should be privileged and to every one taking the Eucharist was given a plenary indulgence for the dead.[1]

The question which we have seen disputed by the schoolmen, as to whether these indulgences are a matter of jurisdiction or are merely equivalents offered to God by way of suffrage, was virtually settled when Sixtus IV., in issuing the earliest one, specified that it was in suffrage, and was followed by his successors. This has been accepted by modern theologians with general unanimity, the only writer of distinction, so far as I have observed, who holds that the jurisdiction of the keys extends to purgatory being Miguel Medina.[2] The point is not wholly a scholastic distinction without a difference, because, if the keys have jurisdiction, bishops can grant such indulgences, while if the relief of souls is accomplished only through suffrage, the grant can be made only by the pope as the sole dispenser of the treasure. In practice it is recognized that this is no part of the episcopal powers, unless through special papal delegation.[3]

The question being settled in favor of suffrage leads to another and still more important one as to the real value and efficacy of these indulgences. In this the Church had a narrow and difficult path to tread. A large portion of the revenues of the clergy arose from the suffrages which, from time immemorial, it had been their special privilege to offer, and we have seen, when the innovation was inaugurated at Xaintes, the clamor which it aroused and the position which Sixtus IV. was forced to assume that the new indulgences were not intended to supersede the old suffrages, but only to complement them. Another two-edged motive makes itself apparent in the discussion which has lasted from that time to this—on the one hand, the more confident the assurances of efficacy, the more desirable are the indulgences; on the other, if a shade of doubt is cast upon them there is ground for urging their repetition. Accordingly the question has been the subject of endless debate. At first the natural desire on the part of the

[1] Leo PP. XIII. Epist. *Quod anniversarius* (Acta, VIII. 159).

[2] Mich. Medinæ Disputat. de Indulgent. Cap. XXXIV. XXXVI. XLI.

[3] Privitera Manuale Antistitum, p. 306 (Neapoli, 1890).

body of churchmen was to represent them as uncertain in their action, which, as we have seen, Caietano based on the varying qualifications of the souls in purgatory, while the Sorbonne asserted that it depends on the will of God.[1] Leo X., however, in his contemporaneous definition, placed indulgences for the living and the dead on precisely the same basis; in either case the liberation from temporal punishment is the same, and there is no intimation that the result is less certain in the one case than in the other.[2] As this was ordered to be everywhere taught and published under pain of suspension and in virtue of the obedience due to the Holy See, it might seem to decide the question authoritatively in favor of the infallible action of indulgences for the dead. Yet the question has been discussed from that time to this without agreement being reached, and if Diana assures us that God has no free-will in the matter, and that the perpetual tradition of the Church is that the infallible release is promised by Christ, and Cardinal Toletus argues that it is a compact made by God, Bouvier tells us that no one can feel certain of having accomplished in this matter the liberation of a soul, and the Raccolta, after affirming that the effect is immediate, prudently adds the condition, if Divine Justice deigns to accept it.[3] We need hardly wonder, therefore, that modern authorities inform us that there are two opinions on the subject, but that at least it may be safely asserted that indulgences help the dead, otherwise the Church would do what is fruitless in thus applying them, which cannot be admitted without impiety.[4] Those who argue in favor of infallible efficacy, and that God is bound to accept the payment of the treasure, admit, however, that the indulgence must be properly granted, and that, if there is not just cause for it, it is invalid, and moreover there may be some special reason why God may make an exception of an individual soul.[5]

---

[1] Mais s'en faut rapporter à Dieu, qui accepte ainsy qu'il luy plaist le trésor de l'Eglise appliqué aux dictes ames.—D'Argentré I. II. 356.

[2] Leon. PP. X. Epist. *Cum postquam.* "Ac propterea omnes tam vivos quam defunctos, qui veraciter omnes indulgentias hujusmodi consecuti fuerint, a tanta temporali pœna, quanta concessæ ac acquisitæ indulgentiæ æquivalet."

[3] Summa Diana s. v. *Indulgentia* n. 4.—C. Toleti Instruct. Sacerd. Lib. VI. Cap. 26.—Bouvier, Traité des Indulgences, p. 35.—Raccolta, p. xi.

[4] Palmieri Tract. de Pœnit. p. 480.—Gury Compend. Theol. II. 1049.—Beringer, Die Ablässe, pp. 43–44.

[5] Ferraris Prompta Bibl. s. v. *Indulgentia*, Art. III. n. 16, 18, 19.

De Difuntos. **MDCC**

SUMARIO DE LA BULA DE LA
á cuatro de Diciembre de mil ochocie
simo Padre Pio IX (de feliz memor
dulgencia plenaria, con calidad de q
del Purgatorio, para el a

Santo es y saludable socorrer con sufr
gios á los difuntos, como nos lo enseña
Divina Escritura, y quien por este med
procura el alivio de las acerbas penas q
padecen en el Purgatorio, no sólo trata
negocio de las almas de él, sino tambi
el de la suya propia; porque ayudánd
las á la más breve consecución del ete
no descanso y á la suma felicidad
reinar con Dios, justamente debe esperar de su Divina Majestad la reco
pensa, mediante la especial intercesión de las mismas almas, que, con
agradecidas, no dejarán de interponerla en favor de los que las socorrier
cuando por sí no podían facilitarse la entrada en la Patria Celestial, sino p
medio de padecer. Queriendo, pues, Su Santidad con ánimo piadoso infl
mar en los fieles este ejercicio de caridad, tan propio de nuestra sagrada Re
gión, y que vaya creciendo el fervor en su práctica, se dignó conceder indulge
cia plenaria por modo de sufragio al alma del Purgatorio por quien toma
esta Bula cualquiera de los fieles que vivan en estos Reinos, dando para l
fines expresados por Nuestro Santísimo Padre en el referido Breve, la limos
tasada por NÓS D. Miguel, por la misericordía Divina del título de los Sa



Fr. J. Card.l Lorenzana, O

Madrid: Tip. de los Huérfanos, Juan Bravo, 5.

LXXXIX. Setenta y cinco céntimos de peseta.

SANTA CRUZADA, DADA EN ROMA
ntos setenta y siete, por la cual nuestro Santí-
ia) se dignó conceder, entre otras gracias, in-
ue aproveche por modo de sufragio á las almas
ro de mil ochocientos ochenta y nueve.

tos Mártires Quirico y Julita, de la Santa Romana Iglesia Presbítero Cardenal Payá, Arzobispo de Toledo, Primado de las Españas, Patriarca de las Indias, Capellán Mayor de Su Majestad, Vicario General de los Ejércitos y Armada, Canciller Mayor de Castilla, Caballero Gran Cruz de la Real y distinguida Orden española de Carlos III y de la Americana de Isabel la Católica, Senador del Reino, *Comisario general Apostólico de la Santa Cruzada* en todos los dominios de S. M., etc., etc.

Y por cuanto vos,

dísteis setenta y cinco céntimos de peseta, que es lo por Nós tasado para el expresado fin, y en favor del alma de

y recibísteis esta Bula, la es otorgada la indulgencia plenaria sobredicha. Dado en Madrid á primero de Marzo de mil ochocientos ochenta y ocho.

Arzpo. de Toledo

This shade of uncertainty affords a reason why, after a plenary indulgence is procured for a soul, it should not be relied upon, but there should be diligence in procuring others and in ordering suffrages for its relief, such as masses and other pious works.[1] The *Bula de Difuntos*, which is sold to-day in Spain for fifteen cents, promises a plenary indulgence to the soul for which it is taken, without an intimation that the effect may be in any way doubtful, and it is described by the Commissioner General as an authentic receipt in full, but the commentators are thriftily agreed that it is prudent not to rely on a single one, but to make matters sure by purchasing more.[2]

---

[1] Ferraris, loc. cit.—Bouvier, loc. cit.—Jouhanneaud, Dict. des Indulgences, p. 202.

Gröne informs us (Der Ablass, pp. 81–2) that there is much popular misapprehension respecting the certainty of indulgences for the dead, and he instances a French pilgrim to Rome who believed that he had secured the liberation of the souls of all his relatives up to the seventh degree of kinship.

[2] Rodriguez, Esplicazione della Bolla de' Morti, pp. 5–6.—Trullench Exposit. Bullæ Cruciatæ Lib. IV. Dub. ix. n. 7.—Salces, Explicacion de la Bula de la Santa Cruzada, pp. 74, 79 (Madrid, 1881). The *Bula de Difuntos* will be found in the Appendix.

Dr. Amort, writing in 1730, furnishes us with a very curious arithmetical computation in order to demonstrate conclusively his proposition that indulgences for the dead are uncertain. He rejects as too severe the assertion of a woman revived by Berthold of Ratisbon, who related that of 60,000 souls accompanying her, only three were admitted to purgatory and the rest were consigned to hell (Raderi Bavaria Sancta, T. I. p. 152), and assumes that of Catholics one-third go to purgatory, one-third to hell, and the remaining third are children below the age of responsibility. Assuming the number of Catholics to be 166,000,000 (a large estimate for 1730, for it is said that within a century Catholics have increased from 120,000,000 to 200,000,000, and Protestants from 40,000,000 to 148,000,000), and the deaths to be 40 per 1000 annually, we have 18,192 Catholic deaths per diem, or, in round numbers, 7000 for purgatory, but to be safe he places the figures at 10,000, or 3,650,000 per annum. In the 1730 years since Christ this would amount to 6,314,500,000 souls. Now of the 166,000,000 Catholics, he says, each one on an average takes out five indulgences for the dead every three years, making, in round numbers, 800,000,000 every three years, being more than enough in 30 years (Dr. Amort says every three years, but he adds a cypher in his calculations) to release all the souls which, since the birth of Christ, can be presumed to have entered purgatory. Besides this are to be reckoned 20,000 masses daily on privileged altars, more than sufficient twice over in themselves to release the daily entries into purgatory, to say nothing of about 600,000 ordinary masses daily, 100,000 communions, and innumerable prayers. If, therefore, he concludes, all indulgences and

Another troublesome question, which has been found impossible of solution, is whether one who desires to take out an indulgence for a soul in purgatory must himself be in a state of grace. To insist on this is very seriously to limit the application of this relief to the suffering spirits; to deny it shows indifference as to the channel through which the grace may pass. Before the subject became practical Peter of Palermo asserted that the performer of the work enjoined for the indulgence need not be in a state of grace.[1] So long as this work simply consisted in placing a coin in the chest of the commissioner it was not to be expected that any doubt should be raised as to the efficacy of "alms" from those in mortal sin. Luther was hardy enough to deny it, and was vigorously answered by Tetzel, who moreover defended his proposition in his thesis for the doctorate at the recently founded university of Frankfort on the Oder, where he received for it the applause of all the professors, showing this to be the accepted doctrine.[2] So long as indulgences continued to be sold there was naturally no question raised as to this, except when one applicable to the dead was based on pious works. As Domingo Soto argues, if it is dependent on the payment of money, the condition of the purchaser is of no importance, if on reciting psalms or visiting a church this must be done in a state of grace, for these works are worthless when performed in sin, but even this limitation was not admitted by Azpilcueta.[3] The commentators

---

privileged masses liberate a soul, it is impossible for one to remain in purgatory. Such a calculation would be much more forcible to-day, when privileged altars have been so enormously multiplied, plenary indulgences have been increased, and their application to the dead so greatly extended. It should be observed that an indulgence or a mass for a soul which is not in purgatory is not lost, but is applied to the rest or to some other one (Gröne, Der Ablass, p. 139).

How little confidence, in fact, is felt in the efficacy of indulgences and privileged masses, and how little they interfere with the revenues of the churches, is shown by a contested will case which came before the courts of Philadelphia in 1891. The testatrix, leaving an estate of from $30,000 to $35,000, bequeathed $4,500 in pious legacies and the whole of the residue for masses for her soul and those of her brother and daughter. The contest was on the ground of alleged unsound mind and undue influence by her confessor.

[1] Pet. Hieremiæ Quadrages. *De Peccato* Serm. XXVII.

[2] Gröne, Der Ablass, p. 83.

[3] Dom. Soto in IV. Sentt. Dist. XLV. Q. ii. Art. 3.—Azpilcueta, De Jobilæo Notab. XXII. n. 30, 31.

on the cruzada, therefore, assume that the *Bula de Difuntos* is as effective when paid for by a sinner as by one in grace, except that in one passage Rodriguez hints at a possible doubt as an argument why repeated bulls should be taken and why the dying should order their heirs to take all the bulls that may be offered.[1]

The discouragement of eleemosynary indulgences by St. Pius V. by no means removed the question from the forum of debate, and the authorities on either side seem to be about evenly balanced. The curious materialist and mercantile view introduced into all these matters by the treasure of the Church shows itself in the argument of those who hold that the condition of him who takes out the bull is indifferent. He may perform all the works enjoined in a state of sin, for the price of the punishment remitted is not the work thus performed, but the treasure of the Church which is applied in exchange for the work: the performer is not considered to satisfy for the punishment but to perform the work, whereupon the pope applies the indulgence, for it has its efficacy *ex opere operato*, independent of the grace of him who gains it.[2] On the other hand, those who maintain that the state of grace is requisite argue on a higher plane, that works performed in sin are valueless, and that no one in a state of sin can win the indulgence in order to apply it to a soul in purgatory.[3]

---

[1] Rodriguez Esplicazione della Bolla de' Morti, pp. 5–7, 101.—Mendo Bullæ S. Cruciatæ Elucidatio, Disp. XXXVI. Cap. ii. n. 10.—Onofri, Spiegazione della Bolla della S. Crociata, p. 229.—Mig. Sanchez Exposit. Bullæ S. Cruciatæ, p. 310.—Salces, Explicacion de la Bula de la S. Cruzada, p. 82.

[2] Ferraris Prompta Biblioth. s. v. *Indulgentia*, Art. III. n. 21–22. Cf. Toleti Instruct. Sacerd. Lib. VI. Cap. 26.

[3] Bellarmini de Indulg. Lib. I. Cap. XIV.—Wigandt Tribunal. Animarum Tract. XIV. Exam. iii. Q. 8, Resp. 3.—S. Alph. de Ligorio Theol. Moral. Lib. VI. n. 534 ad 10.

A quaint argument used, in 1699, by Bianchi (Foriero dell' Anno Santo, pp. 163–5) is worth transcribing, as anticipating and reinforcing that of Dr. Amort. He holds that the state of grace is requisite in the living who gain indulgences for the dead, and urges the "inconvenience" of the laxer theory—"The first inconvenience is that if one in mortal sin could gain an indulgence for the souls in purgatory, purgatory would be, so to say, empty every day. For as there are daily plenary indulgences gained for the souls in purgatory by the confraternities of the Rosary, Carmelites, Cintura, Cordigeri, etc., and there are so many privileged altars in the regular and secular churches on which the sacrifice of the mass liberates a soul; and there are so many privi-

It would seem that a question such as this, underlying the validity of indulgences for the dead, is one which the Holy See, as the source

---

leged masses, as those of St. Gregory and the Rosary, to which is annexed the privilege of liberating a soul; and there are so many sanctuaries, like the seven churches of Rome, Loreto, Jerusalem, Compostella, Assisi, where a visit gains an indulgence, with the privilege of applying it to a soul; it is certain that if, besides these, those in mortal sin could gain indulgences, the number of the living applying them to souls would be greater than that of the souls to receive them. Thus purgatory would be depopulated, and there would be little probability that any soul would remain there long. Moreover, besides the devotees and those under obligations with *Mansionarie* [chapels with privileged altars, and foundations to support priests to serve them], who assist special souls, there are innumerable others who pray and gain indulgences for souls in general. Therefore, if so many impenitents (as most of them are) could gain indulgences for the dead, I would not say there would be an end of purgatory, but souls would stay there for the shortest possible time. Yet preachers in the pulpit tell us that many souls are suffering prolonged torment there and crying 'Take pity on me, take pity on me, O my friends!' I know that it would be not an undesirable but a desirable thing that purgatory, if possible, should be always depopulated, and that it should be only a frontier custom-house to be passed through, but it is unseemly that we should be saying that souls suffer so long in purgatory, and at the same time say that there are so many who gain and can gain plenary indulgences, efficacious and certain. And this unseemliness would increase immensely if we admit that indulgences act in purgatory *per modum absolutionis*, with power to remit punishment *ex opere operato*, without reference to the condition or state of the operator. This would render purgatory only a contemptible custom-house of transit (*gabelluccio di passagio*).

"Another inconvenience is that this belief induces a confidence in the impenitent that the souls thus benefited will obtain for them final penitence. Too often have I heard this used from the pulpit as a stimulus, with the promise that whoever helps the souls in purgatory by giving them frequent suffrages will be helped by them in return, and they will not suffer him to die impenitent. This merely confirms them in obstinate perseverance in offending God, with the certain hope of final conversion."

This latter paragraph refers to a curious feature in the reciprocal interchange of benefits between the living and the dead, which has attained considerable development in modern times. A person in trouble, in place of making a vow to God or calling upon the saints, will promise one or more masses to the "bonnes âmes" in purgatory if they will help him. This leads to a traffic in masses sufficient to sustain in Paris a little monthly journal entitled "L'Écho du purgatoire," of which the numbers for 1879 are before me. It contains numerous communications, frequently accompanied with remittances of two francs for each mass, relating the experience of the correspondent in the successful result of such a promise. A person wants a situation and obtains it in

of these graces, could not allow to remain in dispute for three centuries, yet when, in 1822, the Congregation of Indulgences was asked whether the state of grace is requisite in gaining them for the dead either directly or indirectly, it shuffled the question off by postponing it without a decision, and again, in 1847, when the Bishop of S. Flour reported that a debate had arisen among the priests of his diocese whether a man in mortal sin can win for the dead an indulgence for which communion is not required, the evasive answer was a command to consult good authors.[1] Consequently "good authors" are confusingly at odds. Bouvier takes the ground that when confession and communion are requisite for the indulgence, the person gaining it must necessarily be in a state of grace, but that when these are not conditioned the preponderance of authority is in favor of its being unnecessary. Palmieri, on the other hand, says that the more common opinion requires it. Beringer hedges by asserting that the former opinion is probable, but the latter is safer, which, therefore, it is well to follow in practice, adding, however, that the laxer view is of much service in not preventing

---

this manner (p. 20); a man is robbed and promises two masses if he recovers the money, and next day it is returned to him (p. 21); an invalid vows a *novena* for recovery on September 8th, and threatens, if the illness is prolonged beyond that time, never to pray again for the poor souls, and the cure comes on that day (p. 22); a conflagration threatens a house, the owner of which promises masses if it escapes, and the flames miraculously stop short of it (p. 49); a landlord has a tenant who does not pay and is too powerful to be sued; he commences a *novena* for the kindred of the tenant, who immediately sends him the rent (p. 50); a freshet threatens a man's property, he promises five masses and the waters subside without injury (p. 81); a man has a lawsuit with an old friend and vows nine masses if the good souls will enlighten his adversary, who thereupon abandons the suit and seeks a reconciliation (p. 121); another escapes from a serious family difficulty by merely promising to subscribe to the *Écho* (p. 176); another eludes the conscription by a promise to publish the result, if favorable, in the *Écho* (p. 175); another, involved in an important lawsuit, gains it by simply invoking the *bonnes âmes* (p. 201). The most frequent occasions for their interposition, however, seem to be for students and others who have failed to pass their examinations. A typical example of this is a girl who had been sent back for a second trial. She invoked the *bonnes âmes*, and then with closed eyes opened her text-books at random, reading the paragraphs on which her glance happened to fall: in the examination-room the next day the questions were confined to these special passages, and she passed with honor (p. 140).

[1] Decr. Authent. n. 442, 615.

those in sin from attempting to win indulgences for suffering souls.[1]

Privileged altars—that is, altars at which a mass celebrated for an individual soul liberates it at once from purgatory—are always classed as indulgences, and form a large portion of the existing means of aiding the dead. We have seen that they took their rise in the so-called grant of "Paschasius V." to the church of St. Praxeda, the success of which naturally led to imitations until the church at Santa Maria Liberatrice fabricated a grant from Silvester I., under which a single mass liberated a soul.[2] We have also seen that Leo X. and Clement VII. made occasional concessions of the kind. Gregory XIII., towards the close of the sixteenth century, has the reputation of extending these privileges until there was scarce a town in Italy in which there were not one or two.[3] It was natural that churches possessing such privilege should seek to make the most of it as a source of profit. From a contemporary document, in a trial before the Inquisition of Toledo, we chance to learn that a mass on such an altar was charged at the high price of four reales,[4] and the desire to stimulate so lucrative a business led to the printing and dissemination of false miracles and promises of immediate liberation not justified by the terms of the grant, all of which led Sixtus V. to

[1] Bouvier, Traité des Indulgences, p. 38.—Palmieri Tract. de Pœnit. p. 482.—Beringer, Die Ablässe, p. 64.

[2] Bianchi Foriero dell' Anno Santo, p. 12.

[3] Jouhanneaud, Dict. des Indulgences, p. 329. Amort (De Indulg. I. 212; II. 285) gives one granted by Gregory, in 1577, to the altar of St. Juvenal in the cathedral of Narni.

[4] Proceso de Hernando Valente (MSS. Königl. Bibliothek, Halle, Yc. 20, T. I.).

I believe that at present, owing to the multiplication of privileged altars, the price charged for masses at them is the same as for the unprivileged. This was not formerly the case. In a concession of privileged masses, in 1761, for All Saints there is a condition that the "alms" for the mass, *licet privilegiata*, shall only be the regular amount as defined by the custom of the diocese.—Decr. Authent. n. 255.

That the object in obtaining this privilege was pecuniary is frankly and crudely set forth, in 1779, in the petition of Antonio Makale of Zlarin, Dalmatia, for a privilege for his altar of the Virgin, and that this was a matter of course would appear from the prompt granting of the request by Pius VI.—Decr. Authent. n. 380.

entertain seriously the intention of abolishing all such privileges, but he was deterred by the fear of scandal from carrying the project into effect.[1] Of course the pressure to obtain such profitable privilege must have been constant, leading to its gradual extension and to abuses needing repression, and that some attempt was made to restrict the number would appear from a remark by a writer, in 1699, that privileged altars were no longer allowed in secular churches except special ones for confraternities.[2]

Whatever hesitation may have existed, on the part of an occasional pontiff, as to the extension of the privilege disappeared in the eighteenth century and its multiplication proceeded rapidly. One of the earliest acts of Benedict XIII., in 1724, was to concede a daily privileged altar to every cathedral church that did not already possess one.[3] Similar grants to the churches of the religious Orders followed—in September, 1724, to all the altars and all the priests of the Dominicans, in December, 1725, to the churches of the Franciscans, in 1726 to the order of S. Johannes de Deo, and to the Augustinians; in 1727 to the Trinitarians; in 1729 to the Recollects of Germany, to the altars of St. Bruno in all Carthusian churches and to the Franciscans of Mexico; in 1738 to all Carmelite altars; in 1739 to all altars of St. Benedict in Benedictine churches, and in 1742 to all the Benedictine churches in Bohemia, Moravia and Silesia; in 1747 to the Sylvestrins, the Recollects and the Barnabites; in 1750 to all the altars of the Scholæ Piæ and those of the Order of Trinity for the Redemption of Captives; in 1751 to the Conventual Franciscans for all their kindred and benefactors; in 1753 to the Order of Merced; in 1754 to that of St. Philip Neri; in 1755 to the Benedictine Congregation of Bursfeldt and that of S. Piero da Pisa, and in 1757 to the Benedictines of Portugal.[4] In 1745 the Premonstratensian nunneries petitioned that the privileged altars granted to the Order might be extended to them, and were refused; but when, in 1763, the privilege was conceded to all the churches of the Order their wishes were doubtless

[1] Binterim, Denkwürdigkeiten V. III. 495.

[2] Bianchi, Foriero dell' Anno Santo, p. 283.

[3] Bened. PP. XIII. Const. *Omnius saluti*, 20 Jul. 1724 (Bullar. X. 235).

[4] Amort de Indulg. II. 288.—Decr. Authent. n. 55, 56, 58, 60, 61, 63, 110, 132, 152, 154, 155, 192, 198, 199, 203, 213, 219, 221, 222, 240, 283. Append. n. 17.—Guglielmi, Recueil des Indulg. p. 168.

gratified.[1] It would be impossible, with the resources at my command, to follow out these details completely, but it is probably safe to say that before the end of the century all the churches of the countless regular organizations were thus provided, especially as, in 1759, Clement XIII. granted a daily privileged altar to every parish church in the Catholic world for seven years, at the expiration of which all bishops were instructed to apply for a renewal in their dioceses. Nor was the grant confined to parish churches, for in lands of persecution, where ecclesiastical organization was incomplete, altars in churches not parochial, and even in private houses, were privileged; in 1761 the same grace was accorded to every altar on the solemnity of All-Souls, and, in 1817, this was extended to those in all churches during the performance of the forty hours' prayer.[2] As regards parish churches, the existing policy apparently is to grant to bishops faculties for seven years to designate a privileged altar in each church; when these faculties expire they are renewed if there is no valid reason to the contrary, and thus the control is kept in the hands of the Holy See.[3]

What may be the existing number of privileged altars under these regulations it would not be easy to estimate with accuracy, but it must considerably exceed one hundred thousand, on each of which a mass to liberate a soul from purgatory can be celebrated daily.[4] But this does not by any means represent the total of privileged masses. There are personal privileges which render every altar privileged to the celebrant.[5] This was one of the earliest forms

[1] Decr. Authent. n. 145, 262.

[2] Decr. Authent. n. 247, 251, 252, 255, 536.

[3] Decr. Authent. n. 538, 554, 572, 575.

[4] I have not been able to obtain statistics as to the number of parishes in the Catholic world, but among the 20,000,000 Catholic souls who are under the charge of the Propaganda there are about 30,000 churches and chapels (Missiones Catholicæ cura S. Congregationis de Propaganda Fide descriptæ in anno 1892, Romæ, 1892). Less than half of these however are probably parish churches. In Ireland there are 1313 parishes for 3,473,250 Catholics, or one for every 2645 souls; in Holland, 1235 for 1,738,600, or one for every 1408. Taking the average of these, if the total number of Catholics is 200,000,000, there would be about 105,000 parishes. To this must be added the churches of the regular Orders, which are numerous.

[5] It was decided, in 1852, that a priest enjoying a personal privilege can earn his fee by celebrating at an unprivileged altar (Decr. Authent. n. 653). This personal privilege therefore has a definite pecuniary value.

which the concession assumed. In 1513 Julius II. granted that all Observantine Franciscans, by repeating the penitential psalms or five Paters and Aves before the sacrament, could liberate a soul from purgatory on three feasts during the year, and this was confirmed by Leo X. in 1518. Leo also decreed that any Franciscan, by celebrating three masses on any altar, could liberate the soul of a relative within the third degree of kinship, and he granted the same favor to the members of the Benedictine Congregation of Justina. In 1524 Clement VII. conceded to the Minims of S. Francisco de Paula that in all their churches the superior and the senior brother could celebrate a privileged mass on every Monday and Wednesday. In 1541 Paul III. granted to the Confraternity for educating orphans, and, in 1560, Pius IV. conceded to the Confraternity of St. Roch that any mortuary mass celebrated by them should be privileged.[1] Personal privilege of this kind is still granted. In 1747 Benedict XIV. conferred it on the Confraternity of S. Caietano for the souls of members; in 1777, Pius VI. did the same for the Order of the Trinity, and, in 1838, Gregory XVI. granted to the Congregation of Missions that the superior shall have a personal privileged altar four days and each priest three days in the week.[2] How many congregations and confraternities enjoy these privileges it would be impossible to say. There are also certain masses that are privileged, such as the mass of the Rosary, which can be celebrated only by Dominicans, and the mass of St. Gregory.[3] Nor is this all, for there are many blessed objects the possession of which confers on the priest this personal privilege. It is true that Domingo Soto argues strenuously against this belief—"The clemency of the pious," he says, "towards the tormented souls in purgatory has so increased in our time that by importunate supplication there was extorted an indulgence from the pope that any one holding a certain blessed pebble and reciting a Pater or an Ave can release a soul. I will not call this a pious fraud, for that is an expression of the heretics . . . . but it is to accuse God of wanton cruelty to suppose that he would torture atrociously a soul for three years whose liberation could be had by touching a pebble and reciting a single Pater or Ave. The

[1] Amort de Indulg. II. 284–5.—Ferraris Prompta Biblioth. s. v. Indulg. Art. v. n. 13.—Raccolta (Camerino, 1803, p. 161).

[2] Decr. Authent. n. 160, 371, 501.

[3] Bianchi, Foriero, p. 302.—Ferraris, s. v. *Missa* Art. XIV. n. 24–32.

pope conceded all he could, but it is not credible that he believed his concession to be what the applicants thought it . . . . if purgatory can be so easily evaded it ceases to inspire men with fear."[1] Yet what seemed incredible to Soto passed into the current belief and practice of the Church. Bishop Zerola, it is true, draws a technical distinction as regards privileged masses If a priest, he says, has a bead blessed so that at whatever altar he celebrates he liberates a soul (and Gregory XIII. gave such a one to me), and he is asked to celebrate on a privileged altar, it is safer to use the altar, for the bead does not satisfy the request.[2] But it was not only objects blessed personally by the pope that had this power. A grant by Urban VIII., in 1625, confirmed by Innocent XII. at the close of the century, to the good Benedictines of Monserrat, enriched the crosses and medals which they manufactured with the privilege that any priest possessing one can twelve times a year liberate a soul by celebrating three masses.[3] Even more efficacious is the medal known as that of the Five Saints, under which, as we are told, a priest possessing one and celebrating at a privileged altar can liberate three souls by a single mass—one by the indulgence of the altar, the second by the indulgence of the medal, and the third by applying his own indulgence from the medal.[4]

The facilities for extricating in this manner souls from purgatory having increased so enormously since Bianchi and Amort considered them excessive, it becomes even more important to determine what is the actual value of a privileged mass. The formula of concession to the altar manifests no doubt whatever as to the result; it is a formal liberation from the pains of purgatory by way of suffrage, based on the treasure, and infers that God ratifies the act.[5] Yet

[1] Dom. Soto in IV. Sentt. Dist. XXI. Q. ii. Art. 2.—Somewhat similar is an indulgence granted by Clement VII. to the scapular of the Holy Trinity and still current in the seventeenth century. The purchaser for two reales not only received a plenary for himself, but on three Saturdays in a year could release a soul by reciting before the venerable sacrament the penitential psalms or five Paters and Aves.—Perez de Lara, Compendio de las tres Gracias, pp. 22–24.

[2] Zerolæ Tract. de Jubilæo Lib. I. Cap. xiv. n. 28.

[3] Amort de Indulg. I. 215.

[4] Bianchi, Foriero, p. 356.

[5] "Ut quandocunque sacerdos aliquis sæcularis vel cujusvis ordinis, congregationis vel instituti regularis missam pro anima cujuscumque Christifidelis qui Deo in charitate conjuncta ab hac luce migraverit, ad altarem præfatum cele-

there are various sources of uncertainty which serve to render it prudent not to depend too confidently on a single mass. Ferraris, while he quotes Katzenberger to prove that God is bound to accept the equivalent offered from the treasure, yet admits that it cannot be known whether he may not have reason to make an exception in any individual case.[1] The question was one on which no authoritative decision seems to have been rendered until 1840, when, in response to a direct enquiry by the Bishop of Saint-Flour the Congregation of Indulgences replied that, as respects the intention of the pope and the use of the power of the keys, it is a plenary indulgence, liberating the soul forthwith, but as respects efficiency it is to be understood as an indulgence of which the measure depends on the pleasure and acceptance of the Divine Mercy.[2] As early as 1745, indeed, the Holy See had felt that it was somewhat compromised by the confident promises made by churches which possessed privileged altars; that of S. Lucia of Rome, under a grant made by Gregory XIII., in 1577, had been in the habit of issuing certificates which read "this very soul will be delivered from purgatory the same as if the mass had been celebrated at the altar of St. Gregory," and these it was ordered to change to "each mass shall obtain the same end as if it had been celebrated at the privileged altar of the monastery of St. Gregory."[3] Binterim, in fact, among the tests for fraudulent indulgences, enumerates as forgeries those which promise the infallible liberation of one or more souls from purgatory, even when they are displayed in sacristies or printed in books of devotion.[4]

---

brabit, anima ipsa de thesauro ecclesiæ per modum suffragii indulgentiam consequatur; ita ut Domini Nostri Jesu Christi ac Beatissimæ Virginis Mariæ sanctorumque omnium meritis sibi suffragantibus a purgatorii pœnis liberetur, concedimus et indulgemus."—Bened. PP. XIII. Const. *Omnius saluti* (Bullar. X. 236). Cf. Decr. Authent. n. 192, 199, 219, 221 etc.—Ferraris Prompta Biblioth. s. v. *Indulgent.* Art. III. n. 17.

[1] Ferraris s. v. *Indulgent.* Art. III. n. 17, 19.

[2] Decr. Authent. n. 522. This is the decree as printed. As originally drawn it made a further admission and added "Quod spectat ad applicationem Indulgentiæ tali animæ defuncti, an fieri debeat necne, non potest certo definiri; cum defunctus non sit amplius subditus concedentis, nec ulla adsit Dei promissio in S. Litteris, qua de infallibilitate talis acceptionis, pro suæ satisfactione justitiæ, Ecclesiam et fideles certiores fecerit."—Sacr. Congr. Indulgent. de Gregorio Missarum Tricenario, p. 27 (Roma, 1884).

[3] Decr. Authent. n. 139.

[4] Binterim, Denkwürdigkeiten, V. III. 501.

There are other sources of uncertainty than this. The long-debated question as to the validity of sacraments in polluted hands had been so thoroughly settled, on the authority of St. Augustin, in repressing the Waldensian heresies, that one would scarce look to see it started again with respect to masses on privileged altars, yet it came to be argued that, although the sacrament is perfect, the priest in mortal sin is not capable of receiving the indulgence and applying it to the soul.[1] This might well seem to be an over-refinement, and yet when, after a century and a half, the Bishop of Saint-Flour, in 1847, applied for a resolution of his doubts on the subject, the Congregation of Indulgences evaded a direct reply by telling him to consult approved authors.[2] There is another and more serious cause of doubt, arising likewise from the person of the ministrant, which no Congregation of Indulgences can remove. This is whether the priest has a sufficiently definite intention while performing his functions, and, if he has such intention, whether he directs it aright, for if he chooses to misapply the indulgence it is in his power to do so. With priests of the regular Orders, moreover, there is an additional complication, for many authors hold that the application follows the will of his superior and not his own; it is true that there are two opinions as to this, but Diana holds that both are equally probable.[3] There are also intricate questions concerning the solemnities—black draperies, feast-days and semi-double and double offices, unintelligible to the student not versed in the niceties of ritual, which have given rise to uncertainties and have required official decision.[4] How serious may be the consequences of the neglect of any minute detail may be gathered from a single instance. In 1825 the Oblate Missionaries of the Virgin were granted a privileged altar in each of their churches; in 1867 the attention of the general of the Order was awakened to the fact that as a rule none of the churches had fixed, but only portable, altars, and he prayed that the high altar in each church might be considered privileged, even though it were portable. Pius IX. responded by benignantly making good

[1] Bianchi, Foriero, p. 178.

[2] Decr. Authent. n. 615.

[3] Summa Diana s. v. *Missam applicare* n. 5, 6.—Ferraris Prompta Biblioth. s. v. *Indulgent.* Art. III. n. 19.

[4] Decr. Authent. n. 720, 755, 757. A double office is when the antiphons are sung both before and after the psalm. It is more solemn and requires a double number of candles and singers.—Macri Hierolexicon s. v. *Duplex.*

all defects that had occurred in the celebration on these illegitimate altars, so far as the application of the indulgence to souls in purgatory was concerned, and gave instructions for their avoidance in the future.[1] Now here was a pious Order which, through its ignorance for forty-two years, was allowing to languish in purgatory innumerable souls which it was paid to release and thought that it was releasing. It is an instructive illustration of the improvidence of Providence in resigning control of the destiny of its creatures and entrusting this to the fallible hands of those who, with the best intentions, are constantly liable to make mistakes.

[1] Decr. Authent. n. 766.

CHAPTER VII.

THE REFORMATION.

The development of the system of indulgences had not been unaccompanied with protests from those who were hardy enough to view with disaffection the growth of all-pervading sacerdotalism. We need not enquire as to the opinions of the Cathari or Albigenses, for they were outside of the Christian pale, and their dualism necessarily excluded all notions of the kind. The earliest of the true heretics, the Petrobrusians or followers of Pierre de Brueys, who was burned at Saint-Gilles, in 1126, flourished at a time anterior to the development of indulgences, and consequently did not express disbelief in them, but they ridiculed the offerings and the suffrages for the dead and denied their efficacy.[1] The same may be said of the Henricians, or disciples of Henry of Lausanne the successor of Pierre de Brueys, who were suppressed through the efforts of St. Bernard. The earlier Waldenses belong to the same category; in rejecting sacramental confession and asserting that the ministration and suffrages of those in mortal sin were worthless, they impliedly rendered indulgences impossible.[2] Their scattered communities, however, during centuries of persecution, did not always entertain the same tenets. Those who were burned in Cologne and Mainz at the close of the fourteenth century denied the existence of purgatory and pronounced indulgences to be frauds invented through greed.[3] About the same period the *Nobla Leyczon* rejects all human power to pardon sin, for it is God alone who pardons,[4] yet at the same time the Waldenses of Pomerania had

[1] Petri Venerab. Tract. contra Petrobrusianos Præfat. (Migne, CLXXXIX. 722).

[2] Alani de Insulis contra Hæreticos, Lib. II. Cap. 8, 9, 12.

[3] Döllinger, Beiträge zur Sektengeschichte des Mittelalters, p. 620 (München, 1890).—Tract. de Paup. de Lugduno (Martene Thesaur. V. 1792).

[4] La Noble Leçon, v. 411–15 (Éd. Montet, p. 64)—

"Que tuit li papa que foron de Salvestre entro en aquest,
Et tuit li cardenal, e tuit li evesque, e tuit li aba, tuit aquisti ensemp,
Non han tant de poesta de dever asolver qu'ilh poysan perdonar
A nenguna creatura pur un peca mortal.
Solament Dio perdona que autre non o po far."

imbibed enough of the beliefs around them to hold that confession and absolution would for a year admit a man directly to heaven, and even speaking with a minister preserved from damnation for a twelvemonth; in one case we hear of a legacy of eight marks to procure prayers for the soul after death.[1]

The Flagellants were another sect of heretics who denied the efficacy of sacramental absolution and indulgences. When a wave of repentance, stimulated by the Black Death, spread over Christendom in 1349, it expressed itself in the shape of the sharpest penance. Companies spontaneously formed themselves which wandered around for thirty-three days, scourging themselves with "scorpions" having triple lashes garnished with iron points, and the vigor displayed in their use is described by an eye-witness as "most pious and horrible." It was an effort to restore peace on earth and goodwill, but the Flagellants superseded all priestly ministrations, and when they lashed each other it was accompanied with the formula, "May God remit to thee all thy sins!" holding that by this discipline they were fully absolved. This was a dangerous exercise of private judgment which threatened the autocracy of the Church, and Clement VII., in his bull *Inter solicitudines*, October 20, 1349, condemned it as unauthorized and in contempt of the keys, and ordered its rigid suppression.[2] The persecution which followed was not mild, and converted the potential heresy into an actual one. Cut off from the Church, the Flagellants naturally denied its authority, and under various names and disguises they developed uncompromising anti-sacerdotalism. Under the designation of Brethren of the Cross they were discovered in 1414 at Sangerhausen, in Misnia, holding the belief that certain writings laid by angels on the altar of St. Peter, in 1343, had vacated the authority of pope and prelate: the baptism of water had been replaced by the baptism of blood, drawn by their scourges, which cleansed them of sin and without which salvation was impossible. This was the only sacrament necessary; confession and absolution were valueless, but all sins could be washed out by flagellation, and indulgences were, of course, unavailing. The butchery of these poor

[1] Wattenbach, Sitzungsberichte der Preuss. Akad. 1886, pp. 51, 52.

[2] Chron. Ægidii de Muisis (De Smet, Corp. Chronic. Flandriæ, II. 355–8).—Herm. Corneri Chron. ann. 1250 (Eccard. Corp. Hist. Med. Ævi, II. 1083–4).—Mag. Chron. Belgic. ann. 1349 (Pistorii Rer. Germ. Scriptt. III. 328).—Trithem. Chron. Hirsaug. ann. 1349.

wretches in 1414 and 1416 effectually suppressed the heresy, and little more is heard of it.[1]

More serious was the revolt led by John Wickliffe. When the Great Schism commenced, in 1379, he had already advanced far on his career as a reformer, but the spectacle of two angry antagonists cursing each other and using all spiritual and temporal weapons for mutual destruction sharpened and stimulated his zeal. Though he did not deny purgatory or the sacrament of penitence, his predestinarian theories rendered superfluous the received machinery of salvation and he rejected with ridicule the treasure of the Church subject to papal dispensation. When, in 1382, Urban VI. commissioned the Bishop of Norwich to preach a crusade in England against France as a supporter of his rival, Clement VII., with all the customary indulgences and dispensations, Wickliffe earnestly opposed it in several tracts. In the *Trialogus*, which contains the most authoritative exposition of his system, he expresses boundless contempt for indulgences, which he attributes to the temporalities of the Church; if it could be stripped of these there would be an end of the blasphemies concerning the spiritual power of the pope to absolve from guilt and punishment and the baseless concession of indulgences beyond what Christ and his Apostles ever attempted, and infinite other blasphemies; it is blasphemy for the pope to pretend to grant indulgences.[2] The Lollards accepted these teachings and professed them uncompromisingly when, in 1388, they answered the charges against them by an outspoken profession of their faith.[3]

[1] Gobelini Personæ Cosmodrom. Ætas VI. Cap. 93.—Cf. Gersonis de Secta Flagellator. (Von der Hardt, III. 98–102); Theod. Vric Hist. Concil. Constant. Lib. IV. Dist. xiii. (Ibid. I. 126–33.)

[2] Amort de Indulg. I. 73.—Rymer Fœdera, VII. 393.—Cruciatæ Cap. 2, 10 (Buddensieg's Latin Works of Wiclif, II. 592, 627).—Arnold's Select English Works of John Wyclif, Serm. XXIV. XLVII. LXI. XCIV. CII.—Trialogi Lib. IV. Cap. 1, 2, 18, 32.

[3] Arnold's Select English Works III. 459–60.—"Cristen men seyne that these indulgencis, by maner as thai bene tied in writyng, done mykel harme to Cristen soulis and sownen erroure ageyne tho gospel. . . . Also tho pepul bileveth more to suche dede bullis then to Cristis gospel, for thai bileven to have more thonke of God for spendyng of ther money at tho ordynaunce of tho pope, then to spende hit on pore men as Crist biddis in tho Gospel. Yit these indulgencis bene fals, for so mony thowsand of yeris as thai speken of schul never be bifore tho day of dome, and after thai serven of nought. . . .

Wickliffe's doctrines were not formally condemned until the council of Rome in 1413, and, as early as 1390, his writings were read in the University of Prague. Yet the jubilee indulgence of 1392 awakened no open opposition when it was published in Bohemia; Wenzel Rohle, of St. Martin's church in the Altstadt, was the only priest who did not preach it, and though he denounced it privately as a fraud he did not venture openly to express his opinions. It was on this indulgence that John Huss spent his last four *gröschen* when he had only dry crusts to eat.[1] Yet the heresies of Wickliff spread rapidly in Bohemia, and, early in the fifteenth century, they found in Huss an enthusiastic supporter, although, in 1403, the University condemned forty-five articles drawn from his writings, including the one concerning indulgences, and, in 1410, Archbishop Zbinco publicly burned two hundred of his books. The clash came in 1412, when John XXIII. issued his bull of indulgences for a crusade against Ladislas of Naples, who supported the rival Gregory XII. This was in the usual form, granting a plenary to all contrite and confessed who would serve a month or contribute to the cause. The papal commissioner, Wenzel Tiem, and his preachers, as usual, did not restrict themselves to the terms of the bull, but announced it as *a culpa et pœna;* they promised heaven to those who bought it, threatened hell to those who refused, and threw in the salvation of the parents of purchasers. The bull had been brought to Prague in May, when, with sound of trump in the public squares, the people were informed where the chests were placed to receive their money, and a brisk trade sprang up. Huss could not restrain his indignation; he announced for June 7th a public disputation on the subject in the great hall of the Carolinum, and he held it in spite of the efforts of the University faculty to prevent it. In this he did not deny the sacrament of penitence or the power of the keys, but he argued that indulgences are only efficient in pro-

---

By thes bullis riche men drede nout to synne, and myche wynnynge and worldly glory is goten to worldly prelatis by hem. . . . Ande more then a man disserves by gode lyif ending in charite schal he never have, for alle tho bullis in erthe."

The forty-seventh article of Wickliffite heresy condemned at Constance was "Fatuum est credere indulgentiis papæ et episcoporum."—Von der Hardt, IV. 1525.

[1] Loserth, Hus und Wiclif, pp. 13, 63.

portion to the contrition and devotion of the recipient; the pope had no power to promise indulgences as a reward for slaying fellow-Christians or for money wherewith to promote slaughter, and therefore his bull is not to be obeyed; it is a mere device for raising money and is simoniacal. Huss's indignation is raised to the utmost by the lying promises of the preachers to grant remission *a culpa et pœna*, which he easily proves to be impossible, and he denounces their greed and rapacity in the strongest terms.[1] In the debate which followed, the sympathies of the people were with Huss, and a few days later there occurred the celebrated scene of the public burning of the papal bulls by a crowd under the lead of Wok von Waldstein, a favorite of King Wenzel. Yet the king resolved to put down the opposition, and three youths, Martin, John and Stanislas, who interrupted the preaching of the indulgence by denouncing it as a fraud, were beheaded; many others were imprisoned and tortured, until the threatening aspect of the people called a halt and they were released. This brought the long-seething troubles to a crisis; the lines were drawn on both sides; John XXIII. subjected Huss to the major excommunication and ordered the Bethlehem chapel in which he preached to be torn down; his followers who would not abjure were excommunicated and summoned to appear before the Roman curia. Yet when Huss was departing for Constance he had no difficulty in procuring a certificate of his orthodoxy from Nicholas, Bishop of Nazareth, the papal inquisitor in Prague.[2] The tragedy at Constance was the result, and also the terrible Hussite wars, which were naturally conducted as crusades with a plentiful distribution of similar indulgences. It is true that in the articles on which Huss was condemned there is no allusion to indulgences, but when, in 1418, Martin V. instructed his inquisitors to examine the Bohemians, one of the questions to be put is whether the pope can grant indulgences in remission of sin, especially to those visiting

[1] Palacky, Documenta Joannis Hus, p. 330.—Loserth, Hus und Wiclif, pp. 129–30.—Joannis Hus Monumenta, I. fol. 171–3, 175, 177, 181, 184–5, 187 (Ed. 1558).

A considerable portion of Huss's disputation was borrowed from Wickliffe, though the harsher expressions were softened.—Loserth, p. 211.

[2] Loserth, pp. 131–33.—Palacky, Documenta, pp. 330, 457–61. Cf. Stephani Cartusian. Antihussus Cap. 5 (Pez, Thesaur. IV. II. 380, 382).

and contributing to churches.[1] The matter formed the subject of debate in the preliminary negotiations at Bâle, but it was dropped, and is not alluded to in the *Compactata* or articles under which Bohemia was nominally reunited to the Church.[2]

Persecution naturally leads the persecuted to deny the powers of the persecutor. The heresy of the Fraticelli, or Spiritual Franciscans, originally was at first only an assertion of the absolute poverty of Christ and his disciples, but, under the careful stimulation of a century and a half of persecution, they came at last to refuse credence to papal indulgences, and claimed that the only genuine one was that which their founder had obtained from Christ for the Portiuncula. In this were unanimous a group of the poor wretches who were tried and tortured in Rome in 1466.[3]

In the ferment, spiritual and intellectual, which accompanied the diffusion of the New Learning and heralded the Reformation, the awakening intelligence of Europe did not spare the increasing abuses of indulgences. The shameless venality with which they were hawked around in every land aroused an ever-louder opposition. In 1447, we are told, throughout France and Burgundy there were many of the clergy, both regular and secular, who in private disputation and public addresses denounced not only the indulgences themselves, but the doctrines of the power of the keys and sacramental confession, on which they were based. This gave rise to so much scandal and threatened so much danger that the attention of the Holy See was aroused, and, in 1448, Nicholas V. sent orders to the Bishops of Châlons and Sion to suppress it energetically, with the aid of the Inquisition.[4]

Men, however, would think and reason; the Inquisition was falling into contempt; it no longer inspired the old-time terror, and a freedom of speech and debate, to which Europe had long been a stranger, was becoming habitual in that great upheaval of the human intellect. While Sixtus IV. was extending the dispensation of the treasure to souls in purgatory a protest against the whole system of indulgences with a negation of their efficacy was uttered in Spain by

---

[1] Von der Hardt IV. 125-7.—Harduin. VIII. 915.

[2] Harduin. VIII. 1793.—Hartzheim V. 768-70.

[3] Dressel, Vier Documente aus römischen Archiven, p. 29 (Berlin, 1872).

[4] Raynald. Annal. ann. 1448 n. 9.

Pedro de Osma of Salamanca, to be silenced by the council of Alcalá and condemned by the pope.[1] About the same time John Ruchrath von Wesel, a leading German theologian of the day, was tried before the inquisitor von Elten at Mainz. He had long been disseminating heresy unchecked in his university of Erfurt, and would probably have been allowed to continue had not the Dominican Realists desired to silence him as a leader of the Nominalists, for his opposition to indulgences dated from the jubilee of 1450. In the articles of accusation it was stated that he believed indulgences to be worthless; in the beginning God inscribed in a book the names of all the Elect; those admitted there can never be erased, those omitted can never be inserted. He whom God wishes to save will be saved, though all priests wish to damn him; he whom God wishes to damn will be damned, though priest and pope strive to save him. Predestinarianism could not be more rigidly carried out to its logical conclusions. In his examination he admitted having written a tract on indulgences, in which he asserted that the treasure could not be dispensed by the pope, because it was not left on earth; compensation of the *pœna* due for sin could not be made from the sufferings of Christ and the saints, because their merits could not be applied to men in satisfaction for their sins. Inquisitorial methods forced a retraction, and the heretic soon perished through age and infirmities in the prison into which he was thrust, but the reporter of the trial seems to think that his error as to the procession of the Holy Ghost was the only one deserving of severe reprehension, and he names various learned men who said that most of John of Wesel's articles could be sustained.[2] John Wessel of Gröningen, who died in 1489, a distinguished doctor of the University of Paris, was equally heterodox. The parish priest had as much power to grant indulgences as the pope, for neither had any; God reserves to himself direct dealing with man, and the pope can no more remit the punishment than the sin. In spite of this and other heresies he died peacefully in

[1] Sixti PP. IV. Bull. *Licet ea*, 9 Aug. 1478 (Bullar. I. 416).—D'Argentré, Collect. Judic. de novis Error. I. II. 198.

[2] D'Argentré, I. II. 291, 296.—Fascic. Rer. Expetend. et Fugiend. I. 325 sqq. (Ed. 1690). Dr. Johann Fabri compared the doctrines of Huss, the Waldenses and John of Wesel with those of Luther, much to the disadvantage of the latter, whom he proved to be the worst of heretics.—Wie sich Johannis Huszs, der Pickarder und Johannis von Wessalia Leren und buecher, mit Martino Luther vergleichen, Leyptzck, 1528.

the bosom of the Church, held in the highest honor by his fellow citizens.[1] In 1484 a priest named Jean Laillier, in his *Sorbonique*, or thesis, presented to the University of Paris for the doctorate, had the audacity to maintain a number of dangerous errors, among which was the assertion that the pope could not grant a plenary indulgence to the living, even though it had just and reasonable cause. The extreme difficulty experienced in dealing with this hardy heretic, and the support which he received, rendering necessary an appeal by the University to the pope, show how lax were current opinions and how rusty had become the machinery of persecution. Equally flagrant was the teaching of Jean Vitrier, an Observantine friar, at Tournay in 1498, who asserted that money should not be given to the church for indulgences, and that they came from hell. The Sorbonne, of course, had no hesitation in pronouncing this unorthodox, but what was done to the friar does not appear.[2] More effective were the measures adopted to suppress a little sect of the followers of Savonarola, who, after his execution, organized themselves under the lead of Pietro Bernardino, whom they elected as antipope. The only sacrament which they seem to have retained was unction with a certain oil, whence they were popularly known as the Anointed. Driven from Florence, they took refuge with Gianfrancesco Pico at Mirandola; on his fall, Bernardino and some of his sectaries were burnt and the rest were sent back to Florence, where they were lost to sight.[3]

Thus at the opening of the fateful sixteenth century there was a widely diffused tendency to deny the efficacy of indulgences, while at the same time the necessities of the thoroughly secularized Holy See were leading to the distribution of the spiritual treasure with ever-increasing lavishness and venality. Alexander VI. was chronically in want of money to aid the ambitious designs of his son Cæsar Borgia; Julius II. was constantly waging war to extend the Patrimony of St. Peter; and when he conceived the project of demolishing the venerable Basilica of St. Peter and erecting in its place a magnificent edifice, which should fitly represent the temporal and spiritual

[1] Chr. Lupi Dissert. de Peccator. et Satisfact. Indulgentiis Cap. 4.—Ubbon. Emmii Rer. Friscar. Hist. Lib. XXX. ann. 1489–90.

[2] D'Argentré, I. II. 308, 341.

[3] Pastor, Geschichte der Päpste, III. 840. Pastor is in error (Ibid. p. 156) in saying that the sacred oil was used to anoint the apartments in which they worshipped. It was the temples or heads of the sectaries that were anointed.

domination of the Church of Christ, after vainly begging throughout Europe for assistance, he had no other resource for meeting the enormous expense than by issuing, in 1510, the bull *Liquet omnibus*, which was destined to have results so little foreseen.[1] It was ominous of the future that, in the same year, the states of Germany formally presented to the Emperor Maximilian the list of grievances alluded to above (p. 295), among which was enumerated the issuing of new indulgences with revocations of the old, for the mere purpose of extorting money, leading to murmurs of the laity against the clergy. The scholars of the New Learning, moreover, were giving expression to their contempt for the frauds of the pardoners and the traffic in pardons, and the popularity of their writings shows how rapidly there was forming an intelligent public opinion which would not much longer endure a continuance of increasing abuses.[2]

---

[1] Pastor, Geschichte der Päpste, III. 710, 717, 857.—Bullar. Roman. I. 502.—I have already (p. 74) alluded to the unblushing venality with which pardon for all manner of sins and offences was cynically put up for sale in this indulgence.

[2] Erasmi Encom. Moriæ (Ed. Tauchnitz II. 342); Colloq. *De Votis temere susceptis*. The enormous influence of Erasmus and the dread which he excited are seen in the secret dispatches of Aleander, the papal nuncio in 1521, who repeatedly alludes to him as the originator of the whole trouble.—Balan, Monumenta Reform. Lutheranæ, Romæ, 1883, pp. 101–2, 129 etc.

Sebastian Brandt, in his *Narrenschiff*, classes among beggars the *Heilthumb fürer*, or salvation carriers, who travel around with false relics—a bone of Balaam's ass, a feather from St. Michael's wing etc.—and Geiler von Kaisersberg, in his commentary, even includes the Holy Coat, said to be at Trèves.—Narrenschiff, No. 63 (Scheible's Ed. pp. 563, 567).

The *Epistolæ Obscurorum Virorum* (Tom. II. Epist. Fr. Othon Flersklirdrii) represent a pardoner promising that his indulgences will absolve from sin as effectively as Christ himself, and silenced by Dr. Reyss, who declares them inoperative for evil livers and superfluous for the virtuous.

Even Johann Fabri, who was subsequently an earnest opponent of Luther and Bishop of Vienna, in his *Tractatus de Ruine Ecclesie Planctu* (Memmingen, *s. a.*), includes in his animadversions—

> Sic dona spiritualia Und alle sacrament
> Sunt omnia venialia Ach got nymant das wendt.
> Nam latas indulgentias Gibt man in alle weldt.
> Causa non discutitur Man fragt nür nach dem geldt.
> Sit reprobus impenitens Wilet nür pfennig geben
> Et si foret dyabolus Er muest in der evig leben,
> Quantum quis deum leserit Es wirt als licht vergeben.

It was Fabri who, as vicar of the Bishop of Constance, started Zwingli on his career as a reformer by urging him to preach against the Franciscan Ber-

No attempt seems to have been made by Julius to publish the St. Peter's indulgence in Germany, and indeed his bull only appoints Francisco Zeno, the Observantine Vicar General as commissioner to organize the cismontane territories. To his successor, Leo X., he bequeathed the burdensome enterprise of the new basilica, and Leo was not only involved in political enterprises demanding large expenditure, but he was recklessly extravagant, always in debt, and eager to embrace any financial expedient promising present relief without much regard to morality or to ultimate cost. The inordinate greed of the Roman curia had for centuries excited the angry remonstrances of Europe, and under the system, or lack of system, followed by Leo, the oppressiveness of its exactions beame harder than ever to endure, while the faithful were rapidly becoming less enduring.[1] When some measures of reform were expected of the

nard Samson, who had come there to sell the St. Peters' indulgence.—Wetzer u. Welte, IV. 1172.

The satirists lost none of their bitterness with the development of the Reformation, as may be seen in the collection printed by Oskar Schade—"Satiren und Pasquille aus der Reformationzeit," Hannover, 1863.

[1] In reviewing the 18,000 briefs calendered by Hergenröther, during about two years and a half, from March, 1513, to October, 1515, it is suggestive to observe how very few are concerned with the real spiritual duties of the Holy See. The great mass of them are presentations to benefices, the right to which had been usurped by the popes since the twelfth century, with the result of either selling them to the highest bidder or distributing them among the creatures of the curia to the infinite desolation of the faithful. "Expectatives," entitling the holder to seize on any vacant benefice, were freely granted, naturally leading to intricate quarrels, the settlement of which brought fresh harvests to the Roman courts, recognized everywhere as notoriously unjust and venal (See a dispatch from Campeggio to Sadoleto, Sep. 23, 1524, in Balan, Monum. Reform. Luth. p. 370. Also dispatches from Aleander, in 1521, Ibid. pp. 59, 83). Another large portion of the briefs consists of grants of pensions to the papal officials assessed on churches and religious houses—pensions which the incumbents had to pay and which they naturally sought to recoup by additional exactions on their unhappy subjects. Still more numerous are the letters of dispensation sold to applicants, by which it would almost seem that wholesome regulations were established by the Church principally with the object of enabling the curia to make money by setting them aside. When to these are added the letters concerning the temporal ambitions and political intrigues of Leo, his financial perplexities and expedients for their relief, it will be seen how few are left to represent the interests of religion. All the abuses so eloquently denounced at the councils of Constance and Bâle are seen flourishing in redoubled vigor. These abuses bore with especial hardship on Germany, which

Lateran council convoked for 1512, the common consent of Christendom demanded that it should commence at Rome, which was recog-

lay defenceless, and some appreciation of them is necessary to understand the delirious joy with which the Lutheran revolt was hailed there.

The annates, or payment of a year's revenue on installation in a benefice, was an extortion particularly odious, nor was it rendered less so by the improvidence which led to its being farmed out as security for loans. July 24, 1513, Leo acknowledges a debt of 13,087 ducats to the Fuggers of Augsburg, to secure which he assigns to them the annates of churches and monasteries, especially in Germany, Hungary and Poland. In January, 1515, he acknowledges a further debt to them of 8000 ducats, secured by a similar hypothecation (Hergenröther, No. 3791, 13677). Even so Catholic a monarch as Ferdinand, King of the Romans, declared, in 1540, that the pope should have no more annates from his dominions, and his brother Charles V. ought to do the same, for the popes do no good, and only seek the gratification of their desires (Dittrich, Nunciaturberichte Giovanni Morones, p. 211).

The venality of the papal court was increased by the fact that all its offices were purchasable and were transmitted by purchase. Leo X. levied a commission of five per cent. on all such transactions, and then with careless munificence made over the proceeds to the Cardinal of Santa Maria in Porticu, Bernardo Tarlato, a hanger-on of the Medici family, whom he had elevated to the Sacred College (Hergenröther, n. 13661). Julius II had constituted a college of 101 scriveners of papal briefs, with definite emoluments, for which they had contributed 74,000 ducats to the papal necessities. In the conclave which elected Leo the cardinals had divided the offices among themselves; this alarmed the scriveners, who threatened to defend their places before the courts, and to avert the scandal Leo was obliged to confirm the brief of Julius and promise the scriveners to refund the money if they were deprived of the offices (Ibid. n. 4850). It was doubtless a financial expedient when he decreed that his chamberlains should not exceed sixty in number and his squires a hundred and forty; that their places should be for life and that they should enjoy sundry privileges in consideration of the chamberlains having subscribed 90,000 florins and the squires 112,000 for the support of the papal army (Ibid. n. 16627)—sums which indicate the opportunities enjoyed by these officials for despoiling the faithful. Leo, in fact, cared little whence the money for his necessities was derived. June 8, 1517, he accused in consistory two cardinals, Hadrian of S. Chrysogono and Soderini of Palestrina, of privity in Cardinal Petrucci's plot to poison him, but let them off with a fine of 25,000 ducats apiece. Paride Grassi, who relates this (Diarium, Romæ, 1884, pp. 49–50), is a little scandalized at it, but excuses him because he needed the money to carry on his war with Francesco Maria of Milan. Moreover Cardinals Riario and Sauli were condemned, and Leo exacted from their friends 100,000 ducats as the price of the life of the former and 20,000 for that of the latter (Ciacconii Hist. Pontiff. et Cardinall. III. 71, 298).

A few of the briefs in Hergenröther's *Regesta* will illustrate the reckless dis-

nized as the centre of corruption. In the instructions to the Spanish delegates they are told to labor for this, because the execrable shame-

---

order of Leo's finances and the expedients resorted to to meet his habitual extravagance.

Aug. 4, 1513. 75,000 ducats borrowed from Andrea Bellanti on the pledge of his pectoral, with a large diamond and other jewels (n. 3954).

Aug 14, 1513. Bellanti ordered to pay 2500 ducats to Francesco de la Fonte for a diamond purchased by Leo (n. 4114).

Sept. 3, 1513. Leo borrows 4000 ducats from Niccolò de' Calcagni and sells to him for five years the export of corn from Ancona for 2700 ducats a year (n. 4350)

Oct. 10, 1513. Leo sells to the Genoese house of Sauli the octroi on cattle in Rome and the Patrimony for five years, for 20,000 ducats in cash and 1000 per annum (n. 4920).

Jan. 7, 1514. Julius II. had formed a college of 141 members on the pretext of assisting merchants to bring corn to Rome, for which they paid him 91,000 ducats. Leo renews their privileges, for which they pay 286,002 ducats (n. 6144).

Jan. 9, 1514. Acknowleges receipt of 10,000 ducats from Simone de' Ricasoli, for which the income of the camera is pledged (n. 6198).

— — 1514. Privilege of grain trade in the Patrimony granted to Piero Doganiere for five years, and receipt acknowleged of 3000 ducats advanced (n. 7386–7).

— — 1514. Sells for 3000 ducats to Piero del Bene all claims for unpaid annates accruing under Julius II. (n. 7388).

— — 1514. In consideration of 5000 ducats advanced by Bart. della Valle, the gabelle on merchandise in Rome are granted to him for three years after the expiration of the existing concession to Geronimo de' Crescenzi e Soc. (n. 7389).

— — 1514. Buys from Fran. de' Baroncelli an emerald for 2500 ducats, and pays with a property in Comtat Venaissin for 1500 and an order for 1000 on the treasurer of the Comtat (n. 7563).

May 2, 1514. Buys from Simone de' Ricasoli cloths to the amount of 3000 ducats on a credit of six, twelve, and eighteen months (n. 8436).

May 15, 1514. Secures an advance of 5000 ducats from Argento e Soc., on a contract to be awarded to them for the transportation of grain, to be credited on their payments during five years, 10 per cent. every six months (n. 8874, 8921).

June 1, 1514. The gabelle of Todi are farmed out to an association, 400 ducats to be paid in advance (n. 9281).

June 3, 1514. To obtain forbearance of a loan of 1302 ducats from some merchants, Leo grants them the "nolos Ripæ et Ripettæ" for two years, of which they are not to be deprived until the loan is repaid (n. 9361).

June 19, 1514. In 1510 a Genoese jeweller, Lorenzo Grosso, furnished to Julius II. a magnificent tiara for 2000 ducats, of which only 500 were paid

lessness of the curia is the chief cause of the obstinacy of the Infidel.[1] A dialogue circulated in Germany, in 1513, between the soul of

Leo now buys from him an emerald ring for 1500 ducats and a diamond and a jasper mirror for 1000, and to settle the whole debt of 4000 ducats he creates Grosso marshal for life of the March of Ancona, with a condition that if he is removed the 4000 ducats shall be paid (n. 9787).

Sept. 20, 1514. Leo borrows 5000 ducats from Leonardo de' Bartolini, and assigns to him all the ordinary income of the camera and the annates of all French benefices (n. 11819).

Sept. 29, 1514. Simone de' Ricasoli is ordered to promise to pay within three months 1190 ducats due to Muzio Colonna and his men for pay in arrears, which Leo promises to repay to Ricasoli (n. 12036).

Jan. 15, 1515. Ricasoli is requested to advance 1800 ducats to Troilo Savelli for pay in arrears, which Leo promises to repay (n. 13693).

Jan. 16, 1515. Ricasoli is called upon to make another advance to Muzio Colonna for pay during the next three months, which Leo promises to refund (n. 13698).

Jan. 26, 1515. Indebtedness acknowledged to Leonardo de' Bartolini for 10,000 ducats advanced by him to pay for cloths bought from various merchants (n. 13849).

These instances will probably suffice to illustrate the improvidence of Leo's financial methods and his perpetual need of money.

[1] "Porque la mayor ocasion que los inficles tienen contra fee es ver y oir las cosas execrables y fealdades publicas que en Roma se comiten y blasfeman de nuestro Dios y salvador Jesu Christo, ni puede excusarse el papa que no las puede emendar."—Breve Memoria (Döllinger, Beiträge zur politischen . . . Geschichte der sechs letzten Jahrhunderte, III. 204).

See also the terrible indictment by Pico di Mirandola in his address to Leo X. on the same occasion.—Fascic. Rer. Expetend. II. 417 (Ed. 1690). Felix Hemmerlin, who visited Rome for the jubilee of 1450, thus describes his experience in his *Recapitulatio de anno jubileo*—"Et nunc facie ad faciem experienter videmus quod in curialibus et officialibus post maiorem et usque ad minimum nunquam visus est execrabilioris exorbitationis, direptionis, deceptionis, circumventionis, derogationis, decerptationis, deprædationis, expoliationis, exactionis, corrosionis et omnis si audemus dicere simoniacæ pravitatis, adinventionis novæ et renovationis antiquæ continuationis usus et exercitatio continua quam pro nunc et tempore pontificis moderni et indies dilatatus." This reckless greed was accompanied by equally reckless morals. Höfler (Don Rodrigo de Borja und seine Söhne, p. 147) quotes from Burchard's Diary his remarks on the marriage of Lucrezia Borgia to Giovanni Sforza "Alexander consuetudinem jam ceptam per Innocentium de maritanda prole feminina prosecutus est et ampliavit. Incumbit igitur clerus omnis, et quidem cum diligentia, circa sobolem creandam. Itaque a majore ad usque ad minimum concubinas in figura matrimonii et quidem publice attinent. Quod nisi a Deo provideatur, transibit hæc corruptio usque ad monachos et religiosos,

Julius II. and St. Peter at the portal of heaven, embodies the most ominous spirit of revolt. Nothing can be sharper than its skilful contrast of the teachings of Christ with the crimes and worldliness of the papacy, and nothing more irreverent than its treatment of the claims of the Holy See to rule the Church regardless of the vices of the occupant of the papal throne.[1] In fact, the Nuncio Aleander, writing in 1521, says that five years earlier he had told Leo that he feared a German revolt, because he had heard from many Germans that they were only waiting for some fool to open his mouth against Rome.[2]

Leo, alive only to his political schemes and to the constantly pressing need of money to supply his extravagance, was blind to all the signs of the times. A so-called bull of reformation, adopted by the Lateran council, in 1514, is significant in the admissions which it makes of existing evils while providing for their continuance under the guise of repressing them.[3] The new St. Peter's was to be provided for, and Julius's bull *Liquet omnibus* had as yet not been exploited beyond the confines of Italy. In the early enthusiasm of his pontificate, September 3, 1513, Leo had resorted to the customary expedient of proclaiming a crusade against the Turk, which he promised to lead in person; indulgences of the amplest kind were published; Thomas, Cardinal of Gran, was appointed legate *a latere* to preach it, and a tithe was levied on all ecclesiastical revenues in Dalmatia, Hungary, Bohemia, Poland, Prussia, Livonia, Sweden, Norway and Denmark, but a fortnight later he announced that the discord between Christian princes rendered it impossible for

---

quamvis monasteria urbis quasi omnia jam facta sint lupanaria, nemine contradicente."

The financial and moral corruptions of the curia are sufficiently indicated in the successive edicts of reform drawn up by the popes from Martin V. to Leo X., the repetition of which is the best evidence of their inefficiency. In fact, it seems to have been recognized as a duty by each pontiff in turn to put forth an excellent series of precepts and then set the example of disregarding them.—Hofmanni Nova Collectio I. 516 sqq. (Lipsiæ, 1731).—Pastor, Geschichte der Päpste, II. 660; III. 833.—Harduin. IX. 1697, 1723.

[1] Goldast. Politica Imperialia, p. 1058.

[2] Balan, Monument. Reform. Lutheran. p. 74. See also Fabri's admission (Opus adversus nova Dogmata M. Lutheri, MM. 4) in reply to the fierce invectives of Luther.

[3] Harduin. IX. 1747.

him to take part in it personally; crusades were growing out of fashion, and the scheme appears to have been financially a failure.[1] There was still money coming in from the indulgences of Julius II. and from compositions made with those whose grants had been suspended, and apparently Leo waited till these were exhausted before organizing on a large scale collections for St. Peter's.[2] It was not until the close of 1514 and the beginning of 1515 that this was done. October 29, 1514, Master Waltrin Nicholas of Toul and Humbert Garsi of Lyons were appointed commissioners for transmontane Savoy, Provence, Dauphiné, Burgundy, Lorraine and Liégeois; December 2d a commission was issued to Master Giovanni Angelo de' Arcemboldi for the provinces of Cologne, Trèves, Salzburg, Bremen, Besançon, and Upsala and the dioceses of Cambrai, Tournay, Térouenne, Artois and Camin; December 29th to Master Pierre Sextor for Avignon and the Comtat Venaissin, and January 10, 1515, to Christopher of Friuli for Poland.[3] In this repartition of Europe, Spain, England and France proper are conspicuous by their absence.[4]

---

[1] Raynald. Annal. ann. 1513, n. 107–115.—Hergenröther, Regesta, n. 4545.

[2] Hergenröther, Regesta, n. 2921, 6223, 8820, 9997, 11755, 13673–6.

It would seem that the jubilee indulgence proclaimed by Julius II. had been farmed out for Germany to the Fuggers of Augsburg on the somewhat liberal terms to them of two-thirds of the net receipts. What between farming annates and indulgences the enormous wealth of the house is not a matter of surprise.

[3] Hergenröther, Regesta n. 12385, 13053, 13090, 13448, 13641.

[4] There was a significant contest in Spain over the permission to preach the St. Peter's indulgence. Bishop Hefele (Der Cardinal Ximenes, Ed. 1851, p. 433) is pleased to attribute the opposition of Ximenes to his repugnance to see the discipline of the Church enervated by it, but this is a gratuitous admission on the part of a high orthodox authority of the demoralizing influence of the system—gratuitous because the motive of Ximenes was simply to drive the best bargain he could for the Spanish crown, which was enjoying the indulgence of the *cruzada*, and Leo was finally obliged to content himself with 24,000 ducats a year and abandon the rest to the state. Adrian VI. tells us that subsequently judicious bribery of the papal officials procured from Leo a bull of June 26, 1521, by which even this was relinquished to Charles V. Then the treasurers of the indulgences bribed the Spanish ambassadors in Rome, as also a cardinal and some other officials, and procured another bull of September 14, 1521, by which they secured control over the whole amount without accountability to any one, and the viceroys, who represented the absent Charles, were forced to compound with them for one-third of the profits, estimated as a whole at 300,000 ducats per annum. Leo died soon afterwards and

The commission which eventually proved to be the most important of all was that for North Germany, granted to Albert, Archbishop and Elector of Mainz, which came about in this wise. The cost of

---

was succeeded by Adrian VI. in January, 1522, when the viceroys applied to him for a revocation of this last bull, which he offered to grant if they would be content with 200,000 ducats per annum clear of expenses, or two-thirds of the net profits, but they declined this and threatened to prohibit the preaching of the bull. A long negotiation followed, in which it is difficult to distinguish between the St. Peter's bull and the *cruzada*, for a renewal of which Charles V. was applying. He was firm in refusing to allow the pope more than 20,000 ducats per annum; Adrian demanded 100,000, but let it be seen that he would accept 80,000. Charles finally obtained the bull for the *cruzada*, out of which eventually the popes received 20,000 ducats per annum, and the St. Peter's indulgence dropped out of sight.—Gachard, Correspondence de Charles-Quint et d'Adrian VI. pp. cix., cx., 48, 49, 51, 61, 170, 171, 177, 181, 189, 190, 259, 260, 261 (Bruxelles, 1859).

England was an unpromising field for papal indulgences owing to the rigorous conditions imposed on the admission of papal collectors and the requirement of a special licence under the great seal before money could be transmitted to Rome (Rymer, Fœdera, XIII. 586–7). As there are no letters in Rymer up to 1522 indicating permission to preach the indulgence, I presume that it never was published there.

As for France, Leo was engaged in an earnest effort to abrogate the Pragmatic Sanction and obtain a Concordat; the Lateran council, he said, had been assembled chiefly to break down the liberties of the Gallican Church (Hergenröther, Regesta, n. 14482); the Sorbonne was earnestly endeavoring to defeat his plans and was always disposed to curtail the abuses of indulgences, so that Leo probably thought it wiser to avert fresh antagonisms by forbearing to publish the St. Peter's indulgence there. The permission of the Parlement of Paris, moreover, was required, and that body had an awkward habit of imposing limitations and supervision. In 1514 the Bishop of Xaintes procured from Leo a jubilee indulgence for the restoration of his church. To enjoy it he had to obtain an *arrêt* of the Parlement, which prescribed that the chests in the churches were to have three keys, one held by the royal officials, one by the local bishop, and the third by the deputy of the church of Xaintes. When emptied, after deducting expenses, the money was to be sent to Xaintes and placed in a coffer with seven keys; the bishop and the Senechal of Xaintonge were to select six persons, three canons and three citizens, each of whom was to hold a key, while the bishop had the seventh. These six persons were to effect the repairs and pay for them, placing in the coffer every month an account of the expenditures and of the money taken out, and certificates of all this were to be sent to the Parlement. There was evidently profound distrust of ecclesiastical honesty in the matter of indulgences.—Preuves des Libertez de l'Eglise Gallicane, II. 144–5. For other instances of similar control see Ibid. II. 145–9; II. II. 98, 101.

the pallium of Mainz was 20,000 gulden, to be raised within the territories of the see. Already within a decade, in 1504 and 1508, this monstrous sum, impoverishing and embittering the people, had twice been exacted, and when the see again fell vacant, in 1514, Albert, who was already Archbishop of Magdeburg, secured a unanimous election by promising to pay it himself. He borrowed the money from the Fuggers, who arranged with the pope to reimburse themselves out of the indulgence by retaining one-half of the proceeds and paying over the other half to the Holy See. This bargain was concluded in 1515, but its execution was deferred until 1517.[1] Albert then put the business of preaching the indulgence in the hands of John Tetzel, a Dominican, whose position as inquisitor shows his good standing in the Church, and whose success in similar enterprises for many years seemed a guarantee of the productiveness of the present one. He had been employed in the jubilee of Alexander VI. in 1500; then he was engaged on a cruzada indulgence for the Teutonic Order, which he pushed with so much energy that in 1507, in the little town of Freiburg, then consisting only of 6000 inhabitants, he collected 2000 gulden in two days. At Dresden the largest churches could not hold the crowds which flocked to hear him, and Duke George of Saxony allowed him to preach from a window in the castle walls to the innumerable multitude eagerly pressing to listen to his tidings of salvation, and the pecuniary results corresponded to the popular enthusiasm. Returning to his native Leipzig, he was received with a solemn procession headed by Duke George himself; here, too, the churches were too small for his audiences, and the curious are still shown the balconies overlooking the spacious market-place from which he preached, with financial results no less satisfactory. In 1509 we hear of him at Görlitz, still in the service of the Teutonic

[1] Janssen, Geschichte der deutschen Volkes, II. 64 (XIV. Aufl. 1886). As usual in such cases, neither party trusted the other. According to the final agreement, May 28, 1517, each had a key to the coffers in the churches, which could be opened only in presence of representatives of both, when Albert's share was to be handed over to Jacob Fugger. On June 15th the coffer in the church of St. Bartholomew in Frankfort was opened and the money put in a bag sealed by Dietrich Wenck, Dean, and deposited with Friedrich Martoff, Dean. The next day it was counted, when the various coins reduced to florins amounted to 272, besides nine florins of light weight and one counterfeit.—Gudeni Cod. Diplom. IV. 587, 591. The latter raises the question as to the validity of the indulgence gained by it.

Order, but when about to depart he was asked to help to put a copper roof on the church; he remained for three weeks and preached with so much power that 45,000 florins were collected, after which a single day at Chemnitz brought in 300 gulden. Subsequently to this he was engaged by Frederic the Wise of Saxony to extend the sale of the *Butterbriefe*, or indulgences, under which was conceded, for one-twentieth of a Rhenish gulden, the privilege of eating for a year milk-food on fast days while earning the merit of fasting—an indulgence granted, in 1491, for twenty years by Innocent VIII. to build a bridge over the Elbe at Torgau, and renewed for twenty years more by Julius II. in 1509.[1] Tetzel thus was no mere vulgar pardoner, but a trained theologian and an eloquent preacher; his misfortune was that he became the scape-goat of his employers.[2] As commissioner of the indulgence he was everywhere received with distinguished honors; when he reached a town all the dignitaries came to meet him; he made a solemn entry in procession, with a cross bearing the papal arms carried before him, the bull being borne on a velvet cushion with gold borders; the cross was solemnly planted in the market-place, and the business of preaching was commenced.[3]

The instructions which Tetzel drew up for the guidance of his subordinates offer no specially reprehensible features apart from those inherent in the system. Formulas of sermons were furnished to them containing the arguments which experience had shown to be most effective in securing liberal sales; in these contrition and confession are alluded to as necessary, but the supreme and infallible efficacy of the indulgence is asserted in the most absolute fashion, and the general course of reasoning shows how all parties recognized the transaction as one purely mercantile. Sinners were reminded

---

[1] Gröne, Tetzel und Luther, pp. 6–10.—Chron. Torgaviæ (Menckenii Scriptt. Rer. German. II. 572–4).

[2] There is a story that at Innsbruck Tetzel had two children by a married woman, wherefore the Emperor Maximilian condemned him to be drowned in a sack, according to the custom of the land, but spared him through the intercession of the Elector Frederic. The story is sufficiently improbable, not because, as Gröne argues (p. 202–5), no one thus guilty could have been an inquisitor and a commissioner of indulgences, but rather because no one at that time would have thought of visiting so heavily so trivial an offence.

[3] Gröne, *op. cit.* pp. 200–1. Similar formalities accompanied in Spain the annual preaching of the *cruzada* indulgence.—Perez de Lara, Compendio de las tres Gracias, pp. 33–4, 66, 67, 69.

that for every mortal sin, besides contrition and confession, there was due seven years of penance, either in life or in purgatory, while these letters were a safe-conduct to paradise, conferring all the benefits of the passion of Christ, not only on this occasion but whenever they chose hereafter to confess, with a final plenary on the death-bed. It was pointed out that if they were starting on a perilous journey to Rome or elsewhere they would deposit their money in a bank, and for five or six or ten per cent. get letters on which they could draw their funds at the place designated, and they were asked why they hesitated for a quarter of a florin to get these letters in virtue of which, not their money, but their immortal souls would be safely carried to paradise.[1] A very eloquent passage to stimulate the purchase of indulgences for the dead represents the souls of the parents tortured in purgatory and calling upon the children whom they have borne and nourished and enriched with their property to cast aside the hardness of heart which withholds the pittance that would release them from the flames.[2]

Everything promised the customary abundant harvest, when Luther's attention was called to the methods used by Tetzel and his deputies, who probably did not confine themselves to the comparatively moderate formulas of the model sermons, but indulged in whatever extravagant rhetoric seemed best calculated to influence the popular mind, as for three centuries had been the habit of the vendors

[1] Amort de Indulgentiis II. 15-16. Although in this the price of the indulgence is assumed to be a fourth of a florin, it was not uniform. In the instructions of the commissioner Arcemboldi and of Archbishop Albert it is stated that the conditions of men are too various to admit of a single standard. Kings, princes, and great prelates are to pay 25 Rhenish gold gulden; abbots, cathedral dignitaries and nobles, 10 gulden; lesser prelates and nobles and traders with an income of over 500 gulden pay 6 gulden; other burghers and merchants whose revenues are about 200 gulden, pay 3 gulden; below these the price is from a half to one gulden. Discretion, however, is lodged with the preachers, and those who have no money shall compound with prayer and fasting, for heaven is open to the poor as well as to the rich.—Gröne, *op. cit.* p. 194.

It requires some assurance on the part of a recent writer in defending these transactions, against the Protestant falsehoods that they constituted a sale of pardon for money, to argue that the Church was merely a loving mother who desired to reward her worthy children, and they demonstrated their worthiness by "almsgiving."—Von Hammerstein, Katholizismus und Protestantismus, p. 286 (Trier, 1894).

[2] Amort, *loc. cit.*

of indulgences. Luther had not been inclined to doubt the value of their wares. Even as Huss had spent his last penny for an indulgence, so Luther, when, in 1510, he was sent to Rome to plead the cause of some of the German Augustinian convents against the vicar of the Order, said that while there he almost regretted that his parents were not dead in order that by masses in those privileged churches he could release their souls from purgatory, but since that time he had been indulging in speculations which tended finally to the evolution of his doctrine of justification by faith, and his conception of the value of works and the application of the treasure was becoming weakened.[1] He was a most formidable disputant, almost justifying the popular belief among the orthodox that he was aided by a familiar demon, for this seemed alone to explain his fiery audacity and unwearied powers of controversy. Better than any other theologian of the day, he understood the people, how to reach them and to excite them, while his prodigious fecundity gave his adversaries no breathing time. One blow followed another; he was always attacking and never committed the error of allowing himself to be placed on the defensive, and if his invective seems to us coarse and undignified it suited his audience, and was no worse than that of his opponents. Yet it may well be doubted whether even his unrivalled controversial ability would have been effective but for the facilities of popular dissemination afforded by the printing-press, which enabled him to reach every fireside.[2]

There would seem to me no reason to doubt the truth of Luther's

---

[1] Janssen, *op. cit.* II. 71.—Gröne, Tetzel und Luther, pp. 35–40.

[2] Cochlæi Acta et Scripta M. Lutheri, ann. 1517. Cochlæus complains that when Luther's vernacular New Testament appeared in 1522 it was speedily in the hands of everyone—men and women of all stations—who studied it and acquired such familiarity with it that they dared to dispute with doctors of theology, and looked upon it as the fountain of all truth. The printers aided, for they eagerly printed everything on the Lutheran side, finding a steady popular demand, while Catholic writers had difficulty in getting their works published, and had to defray the expenses themselves. Even the imperial prohibition to sell or possess Lutheran books was of no avail, for they were only the more eagerly sought and brought better prices.—Ibid. ann. 1522.

This complaint of the difficulty of getting Catholic books before the public and the preference of the printers for Lutheran ones is repeatedly expressed by Aleander and Morone.—Balan, Monum. Ref. Lutheran. p. 141, 581; Dittrich Nunciaturberichte Morones, pp. 7, 206.

assertion that at first he had no intention of creating a heresy or even a schism. There is an air of verisimilitude in his own account of the manner in which he was led, step by step, to advance from a simple protest against the abuses of the system to a denial of the principles on which it rested, involving a rejection of papal autocracy. To do this he was obliged to insist on the sole authority of scripture and to cast aside all the claims of tradition, and when this point was reached the whole structure of scholastic theology and sacerdotalism lay open to attack. He tells us that when he was a young doctor of theology he was aroused by the preaching of Tetzel; this led him to assert that Christians could do more good in other ways, and that he expected papal support in this, for the popes had often condemned the extravagance of the pardoners. He commenced by addressing, October 31, 1517, letters to Albert of Mainz and his Ordinary, Jerome Bishop of Brandenburg, in ignorance of the bargain by which Albert shared in the proceeds. In his letter to Albert he dwells upon the lies promulgated in his name and under his authority; he has not himself heard the preachers, but he mourns the errors which they render current among the people, that sinners who purchase indulgences are sure of salvation; that souls fly from purgatory as soon as the money is thrown into the chest; that the indulgence releases from both guilt and punishment. He asks why the people are thus lulled into false security, since indulgences only replace the canonical penances, and works of piety and charity are infinitely better, which are not inculcated, but are kept out of view for the benefit of the pardons, and these are declared to be an inestimable gift, reconciling man to God and exempting from purgatorial pains without the necessity of contrition. This remarkable epistle ends with a warning that if the instructions to Tetzel are not withdrawn some one will arise to confute them—a thing which he abhors, but considers inevitable.[1]

[1] Lutheri Opp. Jænæ, 1564, T. I. Præf. fol. 1, 2. Of course modern apologists have sought to prove that Luther calumniated Tetzel and his preachers in his reports of their assertions (Gröne, Tetzel u. Luther, p. 63). I see no reason to doubt his accuracy. For centuries the *quæstuarii* had been accustomed to use such arguments and promises; the people were accustomed to them, and Tetzel would never have acquired his reputation as a vendor of indulgences had he not vaunted his wares in the ordinary manner. We have good orthodox testimony that Arcemboldi, the papal commissioner for North Germany, was not

In this last phrase there is some lack of candor, for on the same day, October 21, Luther posted his famous ninety-five Theses on the church-door of Wittenberg. In these he was feeling his way; as he

---

overnice, committing a thousand knaveries and carrying off all the money of the country, and thus assisted in spreading the Lutheran revolt (Balan, Monument. Reform. Lutheran. p. 52). Luther, moreover, was altogether too shrewd to commence his assault by basing his case on calumnies; if he used these assertions as arguments it was because they were of common notoriety and could not be confuted; he was not particularly scrupulous in controversy, but in this case he was virtually taking his life in his hands, and it would have been the extreme of folly to depend on lies capable of easy disproof. One of Tetzel's preachers, Bartolomaüs Rauch, declared at Dessau that he had seen the blood of Christ flowing from one of the crosses with the papal arms—a miracle that had not occurred since the crucifixion (Gröne, p. 96).

Considerable debate was excited over an assertion of Luther's that, in the exuberance of recommending the indulgence, the preachers declared that it would procure pardon for one who had committed rape on the person of the Mother of God. He subsequently admitted that he had no personal knowledge of the fact, but that the rumor was so general that he was obliged to take notice of it (Lutheri Conclusionis n. 75, Opp. I. 113*a*). Tetzel felt this keenly; at this time the controversy over the Immaculate Conception was raging; the Dominicans who denied it were stigmatized as *Maculistæ*, and not long before four of them had been burnt at Berne for false miracles to disprove it (De Quatuor Hæresiarchis in civitate Bernensi nuper combustis, A. D. 1509, *sine notâ*, sed Argentorati, 1509). Dominicans therefore felt it necessary to be cautious when alluding to the Virgin, and such irreverence was calculated to provoke popular aversion. Tetzel, in his *Antitheses* (n. 102) consequently denies that his preachers made the assertion, though he had just previously made (n. 100, 101) claims virtually amounting to it, though not in language so gross. Rumor named Halle as one of the places where he had uttered it, and he procured, in December, 1517, from the magistrates of the town and the archdeacon and provost of the Augustinian convent there, elaborate certificates to the effect that no one remembered his having made the assertion (Gröne, *op. cit.* pp. 234, 236). Wilibald Pirckheimer, who, after some hesitation, adhered to Rome, evidently had no doubt as to the truth of the story.—Pirckheimeri Epist. ad Adrian. PP. VI. (Goldasti Politica Imperialia, p. 1101).

Whether it is true or not is of small importance; the principles taught in the indulgential theory justified the assertion, and it was the fashion of the schoolmen to illustrate their theories by applying them to extreme cases. Sylvester Prierias, one of the most prominent Dominicans of the time and Master of the Sacred Palace, in replying to Luther's declaration that such an assertion was madness, argues that it is not madness, but sound sense to assert that any one holding full faculties of pardon from the pope can absolve for violating the Virgin, using the key of orders for release from the *culpa* and the key of jurisdiction for release from the *pœna*.—Silv. Prieriatis Dialogus, Art. 74.

subsequently said, there was much in them on which his mind was not yet clear and which was presented merely as a matter for disputation, yet they had a most unexpected success; in a fortnight they were known throughout the whole of Germany, in a month they had reached Rome and were being read in every school and convent in Europe.[1] They were very moderate in tone; they did not attack the theory of indulgences so much as the abuses engrafted on the system; the spiritual treasure indeed was questioned, but the power of the pope to remit the punishment and to release souls in purgatory by way of suffrage was admitted.[2] There was much on the subject of contrition and attrition that could not be gainsaid, though it nullified the customary promises of the pardoners, and there was a gratuitous assumption that the pope would rather see St. Peter's reduced to ashes than to build it of the flesh and blood of his flock exacted by his agents. The success of the theses was due not so much to anything contained in them as to the universal rejoicing that some one had arisen hardy enough to utter a public protest. In this the clergy joined as vigorously as the laity, as they were peculiarly exposed to the rapacity of the curia and were especial sufferers from the St. Peter's indulgence. The bull *Liquet omnibus* suspended all other indulgences, not for a year only, as in the case of the jubilee, but for eight years, and there was every prospect of its renewal indefinitely. The Holy See had absorbed the presentation to benefices, and now apparently it was about to monopolize the profitable business of pardon-selling, on which every church and convent depended for a notable portion of its revenues. The prospect was not one adapted to render the indulgence popular, and, in fact, this feature had already caused obstruction to its preaching. The Elector Frederic of Saxony was interested in several grants of the kind, and had refused to allow the St. Peter's indulgence to be sold in his dominions until compelled to submit by an order of Maximilian I., August 27, 1517.[3]

It were useless to speculate what might have been the result had Luther's action been wisely passed over in silence. A revolt of some kind was inevitable, for the Holy See had rendered itself too cordially hated throughout the length and breadth of Germany for the preser-

[1] Gröne, *op. cit.* p. 65.
[2] Lutheri Theses, Art. 26, 61, 91.
[3] Gröne, pp. 28–9.

vation of the *status quo* to be possible, but it might have taken a different and more moderate shape. This was not to be however, for the defenders of profitable abuses were too zealous to permit Luther's propositions to remain unanswered. Tetzel at once ceased his preaching, which indeed he could scarce continue in the face of the rising storm, and hurried to his old teacher Wimpina to consult as to his course. He resolved to qualify himself for disputation by applying for the doctorate, and for this he offered a series of *Antitheses* refuting those of Luther, and setting forth clearly and without exaggeration the orthodox doctrine of indulgences without pretending to defend the abuses of the system.[1] Luther replied with unexpected moderation in a sermon which was argumentative but not controversial or abusive. Indulgences, he says, only do away with satisfaction, but satisfaction consists in good works, and a Christian will much rather perform the works than purchase exemption from them; the division of penance into vindictive and medicinal is a mere scholastic figment; there is no warrant for the theory that every mortal sin requires seven years of penance, and that man's life is too short for the redemption of his sins, for God lays on no one an impossible burden, and his pardon is gratuitous; only after the necessities of the poor in a town are relieved should any one spend money for indulgences; as for the liberation of souls from purgatory, it is a modern doctrine, of which there can be no proof, and he does not believe it; prayers and works of piety are much more certain.[2]

Under the pressure of controversy Luther evidently was advancing, and his antagonists were determined to force him to the ultimate conclusions of his premises. Tetzel rejoined with a series of *Vorlesungen;* Prierias took a hand with his *Dialogus,* Cardinal Caietano issued his tracts, Dr. Eck wrote his *Obeliscus,* and compelled the Leipzig disputation with Luther and Carlstadt. The controversy widened and deepened, for the conservative champions found it necessary to exalt the papal authority in a manner which excited much disaffection, and Luther was obliged in his defence to deny the power of the Holy See, which at first he had no thought of attacking. When finally, in 1520,

---

[1] Gröne, *op. cit.* pp. 72–94. Luther attributed to Wimpina the authorship of the *Antitheses,* whether correctly or not cannot now be determined.

[2] Lutheri Concio de Indulgentiis (Opp. I. 11–19).

he was condemned in the bull *Exsurge Domine* he naturally threw off all reserve and argued that the papacy should be stripped of power and authority, inviting Charles V. to reassume the rights of the Empire. As Cochlæus says, secure in popular favor, he burnt the canon law and the papal decretals and appealed from the pope to a free œcumenic council.[1]

This popular favor, which grew in intensity as Luther advanced from one step to another until he threw off all allegiance to the Holy See, is the most significant feature of the period. The shrewd-witted

[1] Cochlæi Acta et Scripta Martini Lutheri, ann. 1518–20.

The cooler heads among the orthodox recognized the advantage which the innovators gained from discussion and endeavored to restrain the argumentative theologians. Thus Cardinal Campeggio writes "La disputa di lo Eckio ho sempre improbato e scrittolo a lui."—Lämmer, Monumenta Vaticana, p. 15.

One cannot repress a feeling of sympathy for Tetzel, the unlucky occasion of the outbreak, who was pitilessly sacrificed by his employers, although he was no worse than the thousands of pardoners whom the Church had employed for centuries. When, in 1518, Leo X. dispatched his private secretary, Karl von Miltitz, to present to the Elector Frederic a golden rose and to bring Luther to Rome for trial, the nuncio summoned Tetzel to come to him. Tetzel, who was then living in retreat at Leipzig, replied that he dared not come, for Luther had rendered the whole population so inimical to him that his life was nowhere safe. His letter is somewhat incoherent, and shows him to be thoroughly broken in spirit (Gröne, pp. 161–2). Miltitz thereupon went to him and scolded him so roundly that Tetzel fell sick and died of grief at Pirna (Raynald. Annal. ann. 1518 n. 100). A letter from Miltitz says that he learned from Fugger's agent at Leipzig that Tetzel had as wages for his services 80 florins per month and all expenses paid, a carriage and three horses, and five florins a month for his servant, besides what he wasted and stole (Gröne, p. 168). He was said to have died of a fever, but there was a report in circulation that his fellow friars threw him into a sewer.—Georgii Arnoldi Vit. Mauritii Saxon. (Menken. Scriptt. Rer. Germau. I. 1158). His death occurred in July or August, 1519.

Luther's attitude toward his defeated antagonist was creditable. He wrote to him a consolatory letter before his death (Lutheri Opp. Præfat.), and that this was not hypocritical is presumable from a letter of his to Spalatin, Feb. 12, 1519, in which he expresses regret at Tetzel's sickness; he would prefer that he should live with honor, after making some amends (Lutheri Epist. Jenæ, 1556, I. 146).

Miltitz soon saw that the condition of popular feeling rendered impossible the arrest of Luther. He summoned the latter before him at Altenburg; Luther came, Feb. 19, 1519, and in a letter to Staupitz the next day described the interview. They parted good friends, and Miltitz kissed him, which Luther ascribes to Italian duplicity (Epistolæ, I. 140, 152).

papal nuncio, Aleander, writing to Dr. Eck from the Diet of Worms in February, 1521, says that the very sticks and stones cry out for Luther; the priests are foremost in this, not for Luther's sake, but that through him they can vomit forth their long-felt hatred of Rome; if Charles V. were not the best and most religious of men we should witness a most miserable calamity in the Church of God.[1] In his secret dispatches to the curia he tells the same tale; nine Germans out of ten are for Luther, and the tenth man wishes the destruction of the Roman curia; Luther's journey to Worms for trial and condemnation was a triumphal progress, the people turning out everywhere *en masse* to do him honor; they are so infatuated that they would believe in the devil if he spoke well of Luther.[2] Aleander thought that he had won a complete victory when in May he procured the adoption of the Edict of Worms, which he had drawn up skilfully so as to preserve the supreme jurisdiction of the Holy See and to make Charles V. merely act as its minister. This portentous document recited Luther's contumacy at the Diet in the manner best adapted to win the people away from him; after twenty days from April 25th he and all his supporters were placed under the ban of the Empire; he was to be seized wherever found and be delivered up to judgment; his followers forfeited their dignities and their estates were confiscated, while his books were forbidden and were ordered to be burnt, and all this was with the advice and consent of the States of the Empire.[3] Luther was in hiding in the Wartburg; Aleander writes rejoicingly that the Lutherans are completely disheartened and are hastening to

[1] Balan, Monument. Reform. Lutheran. p. 58.

[2] "Contro di noi sono una legione di nobili, conti di Alemagna poveri, duce Hutteno conjurati, qui sitiunt sanguinem cleri et non cercano altro se non irruere in nos . . . Item quasi tutto il clero, eccetti li rettori di chiese parrochiali è soprammodo infetto, e quelli potissimum che sono promoti per Roma fanno peggio che li altri. La plebe fertur præceps ad dicta aliorum e si lassa transportar maxime a Moguntia et a Wormes.—Ibid. pp. 31–2.

"Tutta la Germania è in volta, e delle x parti di essa le nove crida Luther e la decima, se non se cura dei ditti di Luther saltum crida la morte alla corte di Roma.—Ibid. p. 98.

"Tanta è la incognata affetione di tutti questi popoli verso Luthero che crederebbeno al diabolo, el qual già li domina, purchè diceise ben di Luthero." —Ib. p. 165.

[3] Goldast. Constitt. Imper. I. 445. The edict bears date May 8, 1521, but it was not signed until May 26th.—Balan, p. 251.

return to the Church; at Rome the result was regarded as decisive, and Leo X. hastened to address a most effusive letter to Charles; evidently it was considered that the revolt was virtually suppressed.[1] In all this emperor, pope, and nuncio were reckoning without the people, who made a prompt reply to the Edict. Within sixty days of its promulgation a dolorous letter from Albert of Mainz to Leo reports how at Erfurt the populace broke into and sacked the houses of the canons, while the magistrates made the clergy agree to share the public burdens, following this up by exacting from them 10,000 Rhenish florins and banishing some priests; at Magdeburg some houses were broken into and the priests were required to pronounce in favor of Luther; at Leipzig and Eisleben the friars with tears announced from their pulpits that they had sinned in attacking Luther, and begged the people to intercede for them with God. In short, as the archbishop declares, in spite of the papal bull and the imperial edict the number of Lutherans increases daily; it is very rare to find a layman who really favors the clergy, while a large part of the priests are for Luther, and most of them are ashamed to support the Roman Church, so deeply hated is the name of the curia and of the papal decrees.[2]

All this manifests too deep-seated and wide-extended a popular feeling to admit of the easy explanation of the Reformation by the abuses of indulgences or the performances of Tetzel and his fellows. These furnished, it is true, the spark which fired the train to the magazine, but that magazine had been accumulating its explosive stores since the failure at Bâle disappointed the hopes of Germany, and it needed but the spark to produce the catastrophe. Many apologies and so-called explanations have been framed by Catholic writers to account for so prodigious a phenomenon, but they fail to take into consideration the actual condition of the Church, its relations with the German nation, and the incompatibility of its pretensions with the awakened intelligence of Europe and the spirit of independent inquiry fostered by the printing-press. Cochlæus con-

[1] Balan, *op. cit.* pp. 215, 217, 251, 274.

[2] Ibid. pp. 268–9.—"Jamque rarissime inveniuntur laici qui candide et simpliciter faveant ecclesiasticis, sed et bona pars sacerdotum facit cum Luthero et plerosque pudet stare a parte Romanæ Ecclesiæ, adeo invisum est nomen curtisanorum et decretorum Beatudinis vestræ, quæ magno supercilio post Wittembergenses et alii quoque rejiciunt."

tents himself with asserting that Albert of Mainz intended to give the preaching of the indulgence to the Augustinians, who had been great defenders of indulgences, but was persuaded to employ the Dominican Tetzel, who had been so successful with that for the Teutonic Knights; this angered the Augustinians, and especially their two most prominent members, the Vicar general Staupitz and Luther; the former was a favorite of the Elector Frederic and represented to him the despoiling of Germany by the abuses and frauds of the pardoners, while Luther wrote his expostulatory letter to the Archbishop Albert and followed it up with his ninety-five propositions; Tetzel retorted from Frankfurt with his one hundred and five antitheses, and thus the struggle was opened between these two antagonists, which led in the following year to a conflagration.[1] It is a typical illustration of the way in which history is written for a purpose that Cardinal Hergenröther virtually accepts all this, with its *suggestio falsi* and *suppressio veri*. The bull of Leo X., he says, was drawn in the usual form; Father Tetzel was a learned and zealous Dominican; it is true that from selfish reasons there had been opposition to indulgences, they had been complained of in the *Gravamina Imperii*, and the Bishops of Meisen and Constance had forbidden them in their dioceses, but the German princes had been glad to get them for their own benefit; Luther's attack was suggested by the jealousy existing between the Augustinians and the Dominicans and by the covetousness and envy of the local churches which saw their receipts diminish through Tetzel's success.[2] In the same mood Gröne assures us that neither in the bull *Liquet omnibus*, nor in the manner of its preaching was there even the appearance of an abuse, and that Luther and his followers could advance no proof of their accusations; all Catholic historians, he says, from that time to this, have attributed the outbreak to the jealousy between the Orders.[3]

With more or less candor Catholic writers are content to ascribe the Reformation to indulgences, and to drop the unpleasant subject there. Guicciardini, whose relations with Leo X. and Clement VII.

[1] Cochlæi Acta et Scripta Martini Lutheri, ann. 1517.

[2] Hergenröther, Handbuch der allegemeinen Kirchengeschichte, III. 8–9.

[3] Gröne, Der Ablass, pp. 77, 109; Tetzel und Luther, pp. 26–7.—Serrarius informs us (Rerum Moguntiacarum Lib. v. p. 824) that Luther was afraid that his reputation would be overshadowed by that of Tetzel.

gave him ample opportunity of ascertaining details, gives as the cause of Luther's outbreak the unworthy abuse of pontifical authority by Leo. Blindly following the advice of Cardinal Lorenzo Pucci he scattered indulgences everywhere, not only for the living but for the dead, whose purgatorial pains would be thus shortened. It was generally known that the sole object of this spiritual profusion was to raise money; those in charge of the matter had for the most part bought of the pope the right to sell the pardons, and they exercised this with so little moderation that they excited popular indignation, particularly in Germany, where many of these spiritual traders sold at a low price or gambled away in taverns the power of redeeming souls from purgatory. The scandal grew with Leo's liberality to his sister Maddalena, widow of Franceschetto Cibo, to whom he granted part of the proceeds, and she commissioned Bishop Arcemboldi to pillage for her several provinces of Germany. This man, worthy of such employment, performed it with extreme harshness and avarice, so that popular indignation gave Luther his opportunity, and he advanced from attacking indulgences to denying the papal power to grant them.[1] When, in 1566, St. Pius V. refused the request of Philip II. for a renewal of the *cruzada* in Spain, he gave as a reason that the abuse of papal indulgences started Luther to assail the Church and the papal authority, and thus, step by step, to lead Germany into apostasy, and so the *cruzada* might give occasion to disseminate heresy in Spain and produce the same results.[2] Cardinal Pallavicino candidly states that whatever may have been the defects of Julius II., in nothing did he do more injury than in undertaking to rebuild St. Peter's, a work beyond his resources, forcing his successor to continue it, and thus giving occasion to Luther's heresy; Leo suffered himself to be misled by the error which confounds the magnificent with the good and popular applause with benefit to the state; that the profits were farmed to different quæstuarii has a foul appearance, and it would have been better to suffer any inconvenience rather than thus to scandalize Christendom,

[1] Guicciardini, Istoria XIII. 5. Guicciardini was no heretic, and is very severe on Luther and his detestable errors.

Pallavicino (Hist. C. Trident. Lib. I. Cap. 3) denies the grant to Maddelena, and says that no trace of such concession is to be found in the archives.

[2] Relazione di Leonardo Donato (Alberi, Relazioni Venete, Serie I. T. VI. p. 381).

but it must be admitted that the matter could scarce have been managed otherwise, for what prince is there who is not forced to do this with all his taxes[1]—an apology which, in its assimilating the spiritual grace of indulgences to taxation, unconsciously reveals the financial spirit animating the whole affair.

In spite of the attempts of modern writers to palliate the methods of Tetzel and his colleagues, there can be no doubt that they were fully as vicious as those which we have seen condemned with such unanimity ever since the sale of indulgences came in vogue. Floremond de Rémond quotes from a holy Franciscan, Friar Thomas, a remarkable passage in which the practices of the pardon-sellers are denounced with as much vehemence of objurgation as Luther himself could employ.[2] Luther's adversaries, Jacobus Latomus and Berthold, Bishop of Chiemsee, make admissions almost equally damaging.[3] We may perhaps pass over the terrible indictment contained in the *Centum Gravamina* adopted by the Diet of Nürnberg

---

[1] Pallavicini Hist. C. Trident. Lib. I. Cap. 1, n. 9; Cap. 3.

[2] "Vide, quæso, Christiane lector, quomodo Bullistæ, vel potius nebulones illi Christianum populum decipiunt. Discurrunt illi per montes et valles et miseros idiotas facultatibus suis exspoliant. Utque tanto melius ac facilius deglubere eos possent, cum parochis rem et consilium conferunt dicentes: Domine Paroche, apportamus indulgentias plenarias. Quod si vestro mandato populus convenerit, et processiones factæ fuerint, nos tertium ejus quod inde collegerimus vobis dabimus, et de bonorum hominum fortunis una læte convivabimur. Ibi parochus concubinarius, indoctus, mercenarius et non pastor, quo ventrem suum replere et scortum alere possit, cum bullarum portatoribus transigit, qui pecunia inde per fas et nefas collecta, convivantur, saltant, genioque indulgent: interim simplicitatem illorum rident qui opinione peccatorum veniam consequendi, aut captivos redimendi, pecuniam profundere non dubitarunt. O bone Deus quis recensere posset ea flagitia, quæ sub indulgentiarum prætextu ab infamibus istis quæstoribus atque enim redemptoribus committuntur? Sunt enim quidam adeo stulti ut, profligata omni conscientia, Epicureorum more dicant: Agite, lætos agamus dies, voluptatibus indulgeamus: exiguo precio redempta bulla noxas nostras omnes quantumvis graves et enormes, delebit."—Fl. Ræmundi Synopsis Controversiarum Lib. I. Cap. viii. n. 5.

This work has been attributed to the saintly Jesuit, Louis Richeome, but De Backer (I. 634) says that it has been proved not to be by him.

[3] J. Latomus adv. Hæreses Art. VII. de Indulg. (Ed. 1529, fol. 53*a*).—Bert. Chiemens. Theol. German. Cap. 89 (Aug. Vindel. 1531). Cf. L. Surii Comment. Rerum in Orbe Gestarum, Coloniæ, 1586, p. 93.

The *Onus Ecclesiæ*, printed under the name of John of Chiemsee, is even more outspoken. See extracts from it in Amort de Indulg. II. 21 sqq.

in 1522, describing the Roman indulgences as an insupportable burden, sucking out the marrow of the Germans and destroying their piety through the impostures of the hired vendors of these pardons, for these were probably drawn up by Hutten, and reflect the views of the reformers, though Aleander, in endeavoring to refute them, does not deny the abuses alleged, but merely seeks to shift the responsibility for them [1] There was, moreover, one feature in the St. Peter's indulgence which apparently was novel and was peculiarly destructive to morals and social order. The absolutions granted by the Papal Penitentiary to sinners were declared, in 1484, by Sixtus IV. to be valid not only in the *forum internum*, but in all courts, secular as well as ecclesiastical.[2] The very comprehensive bull *Liquet omnibus* granted power to the commissioners and their deputies to absolve for all possible sins and disabilities, and this was construed to mean that the pardons which they sold relieved the offender from human as well as divine justice. Gröne gives the only three "Ablassbriefe" of Tetzel's that have come down to us, and these, although not regular or general indulgences, illustrate the extent of the powers claimed and exercised under the papal bull. In one of them, for an "alms" for St. Peter's, he absolves Mathias Menner for an accidental murder. In another Severin Weiss, a sacristan who had lost a consecrated host, pays a notable sum to protect him-

[1] Gravamina in Comitiis Norembergæ (Le Plat, Monum. C. Trident. II. 165 sqq).

Aleander's reply to these complaints is that indulgences should not be despised because the Germans who preached them were bad men who had been selected by German princes, and who were recalled by the pope as soon as he knew it. It was a manifest falsehood to accuse the Holy See of granting licences to sin, for it never granted pardoners power to remit sins to any one who had not resolved to sin no more.—Döllinger Beiträge zur politischen, kirchlichen und Culturgeschichte, III. 250.

[2] Sixti PP. IV. Const. *Quoniam nonnulli* (Bullar. I. 428). Repeated, in 1549, by Paul III., and, in 1550, by Julius III. Const. *Rationi congruit* (Ibid. p. 785).

St. Antonino (Summæ P. III. Tit. xiv. Cap. 17, § 3) is careful to explain that a bull of absolution does not relieve the offender from judicial jurisdiction. Evidently the claim must have been already put forward in his time. So Felix Hemmerlin, in treating of the jubilee of 1450, feels it necessary to explain—"Nam pœna fori pœnitentialis quantumcumque magna non tollit judicis sæcularis jura ad puniendum delicta, unde criminosus reversus de nostræ jubilationis (etiam solutus) solennitate nihilominus parebit in judicis temporalis jurisdictione" (Dyalogus de anno jubileo, p 3).

self from the consequences. In the third, a man who had accidentally killed his little son is similarly absolved. These absolutions not only release the culprits from all spiritual penalties, but forbid all secular or criminal prosecution, and this is openly done for money on the bare assertion of the so-called penitent, who thus purchases immunity from the operation of the laws of the land.[1] This same thriving trade was driven by Tetzel's colleague, Bishop Arcemboldi, of whom it was complained that if a bishop arrested a priest and sought to execute justice on him, the *frati* came forward with their faculties and released him.[2] It was fortunate for civilization and social order that the Reformation came, for the reckless greed of the curia was fast subordinating all law and justice to its insatiate demands for money and its claims of supreme jurisdiction over all tribunals, secular and ecclesiastical.[3]

There was thus ample reason why there should be a revolt against indulgences and their abuse, and they may fairly be regarded as the occasion of the Reformation, but the cause of a movement so momentous in human development lay deeper and is to be sought in the general hatred of Rome entertained by all classes, clerical as well as lay. Dr. Eck was at last shrewd enough to see this, and varied his assaults on Luther with a discourse addressed to Paul III., in which he bluntly declared that the heresy arose from the abuses of the curia and spread in consequence of the immorality of the clergy; its cure is to be sought in reform, including a diminution of indulgences.[4] Adrian VI., in 1522, admitted all this in his instructions to his legate Chieregati at the Diet of Nürnberg, and he promised

[1] Gröne, Tetzel und Luther, pp. 187–9.

[2] Balan, Monument. Reform. Lutheran. p. 52.

[3] Even in 1574 Miguel Medina feels it necessary to explain that indulgences do not operate against penalties for crimes adjudged by secular magistrates.—Disputat. de Indulg. Cap. XXXI.

[4] "Primo quia contraria contrariis curantur et hæresis Ludderi propter abusus Curiæ Romanæ fuit exorta et propter corruptos mores Cleri aucta et propagata; ideo sanctissimus D. N. pro pastorali officio edat Bullam reformatorium aliquorum defectuum, et excuset se de difficultate Concilii universalis colligendi: quod quam primum fieri possit, velit facere illud et convocare et plura ac maiora reformare. De Reformandis et ponendis in bulla . . . indulgentiæ moderandæ." But he concludes that the only cure is a general council or a vigorous organization of the Inquisition.—Lämmer, Meletematum Romanorum Mantissa, p. 152.

reform, but insisted on the suppression of heresy without waiting for it.[1] This confession and avoidance produced its natural result. The princes of the Empire replied by excusing themselves for not enforcing the papal sentence against Luther, because to do this before the promised reform would lead to a rebellion, as the people would believe it to prove that the abuses were to continue, and they resolutely flung the *Centum Gravamina* in the face of the Holy See.[2] There were, it is true, some manifestations of an intention to correct abuses. As regards indulgences, in the conclave after the death of Leo X., among the engagements taken, as usual, under oath by each member as to what he would do if elected was included the revocation of all faculties issued to Franciscans to preach the St. Peter's indulgence,[3] but the elusory nature of the pledge is seen in the bargaining at once carried on between Adrian and Charles V. as to their shares in its proceeds. Adrian, moreover, proposed to issue a decree embodying a proposition, expressed in his Commentary on the Fourth Book of the Sentences, that the benefit derived from an indulgence is proportioned to the fervor with which the prescribed works are performed, but Cardinal Caietano dissuaded him from this, because it was contrary to the practice of the Church and to the opinions of eminent theologians.[4] As regards reform in general, Adrian com-

[1] "Scimus in hac sancta Sede aliquot jam annis multa abominanda fuisse, abusus in spiritualibus, excessus in mandatis, et omnia denique in perversum mutata . . . Qua in re, quod ad nos attinet, polliceberis nos omnem operam adhibituros, ut primum curia hæc, unde forte omne hoc malum processit, reformetur, ut sicut unde corruptio in omnes inferiores emanavit, ita etiam ab eadem sanitas et reformatio omnium emanet. . . . Quanquam nemo mirari debebit si non statim omnia errata et abusus omnes per nos emendatos viderit. Inveteratus enim morbus est nec simplex sed varius et multiplex."—Le Plat, Monument. C. Trident. II. 147–8.

[2] Ibid. p. 155.

[3] Pallavicini Hist. C. Trident. Lib. II. Cap. 4, n. 2.

[4] Ibid. n. 5–10.—Adriani PP. VI. Disput. in IV. Sentt. fol. clxii. col. 1. Adrian had admitted (*op. cit.* fol. clxv. col. 1), in opposition to Aquinas, that a pope selling indulgences for the *temporalia ad spiritualia ordinata* would commit simony, and he seeks to deceive himself by arguing that they are not offered for the money, but to reward the pious zeal with which the contributions were made. In practice he was more sparing in the issuing of indulgences than his predecessors.—Onuph. Panvin. in Vit. Pont. Hadriani VI. (Platina de Vitis Pontiff. Colon. 1574, p. 348).—G. Moringi Vit. Adriani VI. Cap. 23 (Burmanni Analecta p. 68. Cf. p. 418).

menced with the best intentions and summoned a number of learned men to consult with him on the subject; at first he met them frequently, but the adverse influences of his environment soon cooled his ardor; the consultors found that they could make no progress and they left Rome with the work not even begun.[1] He was irresolute and surrendered himself to the influence of the meanest servitors of the palace whose functions brought them into personal relations with him, so that his court speedily acquired the reputation of being even more venal than its predecessors. One of his chief counsellors was the Datary Enkenvöert, who was under the influence of a valet named Pietro di Roma, because the latter served him as a pimp in supplying him with women.[2] With such surroundings, whatever might have been Adrian's good intentions, no practical results of reform were to be expected. Considerable alarm had been felt at his accession, but this speedily diminished, and soon his opportune death relieved the curialists of all dread, for his successor, Clement VII., a Medici trained in the school of his cousin Leo X., was not to be feared on that score. Under German pressure he could assure his legate Campeggio that since his accession the dearest wish of his heart had been to restore the Church to its ancient splendor and purity, and that he was only prevented by more immediate and pressing necessities, but some years later a shrewd Venetian envoy points out that his desire for reform never manifested itself in practice.[3]

Meanwhile the German clamor for reform was incessant; nuncios and legates were constantly reporting that without it all plans for suppressing heresy were fruitless, for all parties, Catholics as well as Lutherans, clergy as well as laity, were united in a hatred of Rome that could only be abated by sweeping away the abuses of which they complained.[4] In 1527 the pious and orthodox prior of Rebdorff,

[1] Blazii Ortizii Itinerarium Adriani VI. Cap. 22 (Baluz. et Mansi Miscell. I. 381).

[2] Bergenroth, Calendar of Spanish State Papers, II. cxl. sq.

[3] Balan, Monum. Reform. Lutheran. p. 326.—Alberi, Relazioni Venete Serie II. T. III. p. 265.

[4] Balan, *op. cit.* pp. 33, 47, 74, 98, 143, 427, 429, 459, 539, 545.—Lämmer, Monumenta Vaticana, pp. 48 sqq., 65–6.—Le Plat, Monum. C. Trident. II. 228. —Aleander, in 1523, drawing up instructions for a nuncio to the Diet of Nürnberg, observes "nemo fere illic est qui non saltem ob odium sedis apostolicæ

while deploring the sack of Rome, can only recognize in it a visitation of God for the abounding wickedness of the curia.[1] It is a striking indication of the part taken by the clergy in the Reformation that, in 1525, the Duke of Gueldres writes to Clement VII. that he is keeping his territories clear of heresy, but there are so many of the priesthood infected, on whom he dares not lay his hands because of their immunity, that he asks the pope to empower the princes to try them and inflict capital punishment if necessary.[2] Under this common sentiment of hatred to Rome, as time passed on without the appearance of any measures of reform or of the convocation of the universal council so long demanded and so evasively postponed, even religious differences for a time sank into comparative unimportance. In 1540 the project was openly discussed of a union of all parties on the basis of sacerdotal marriage, communion in both kinds, and the rejection of all allegiance to Rome. The success of Henry VIII. in founding an independent national Church was an alluring precedent, and the project came near being adopted. The legate Morone reports that in despair of any reformation by the pope,

sit maculatus."—Döllinger, Beiträge zur politischen, kirchlichen u. Culturgeschichte, p. 253.

The rapid spread of the Reformation everywhere shows that this feeling was not confined to Germany, and that the Church had succeeded in alienating popular affection throughout Christendom. Thus, April 25, 1525, we find Louise, Regent of France, complaining to Clement VII. of the growth of Lutheranism and asking for special faculties to deal with it. June 22 the Duke of Savoy makes the same complaint and request. April 11, 1526, the nuncio Rorario, in a dispatch to Sadoleto from Mariemburg (Poland) speaks of two apostate friars who have come there and have infected all the people with heresy; the Livonians are all heretics and have despoiled the Archbishop of Riga.—Balan, Monumenta Sæc. XVI. T. I. pp. 344, 349, 359.

[1] "Quam magnæ essent illic eorum qui ecclesiæ columnæ seu cardines habebantur, opes, quam extra modum gloria quam pompam verius dixeris, quam recti honestique tramitem longe transgrediens morum vitæque libertas, quam inexplebilis pecuniarum sitis, et quam in omni ferme hominum statu nimis lata vorago et chasma libidinum . . . . Constabat omnibus quam potenter magistratus ecclesiæ legibus atque canonibus juribusque abrogando, dispensando, suspendendo, reservandoque fuerint hactenus dominati. Hæc omnia expendienti omnino videbatur tantæ magnitudini atque superbiæ vicinam esse ruinam, quæ illi hac occasione accidit."—Kiliani Leib Prioris Rebdorfens. Annal. ann. 1527 (Döllinger, Beiträge zur politischen etc. II. 504–5).

[2] Balan, Monumenta Sæc. XVI. T. I. p. 324.

the three ecclesiastical electors and all the bishops except him of Trent were in favor of it. Aleander assured him from Rome that they were hard at work at a project of reform, but Germany had too often been duped by such promises to place any further reliance on them, and the negotiations reached such a point that in July Morone writes that he is ready to run away so as not to be a witness of so unworthy a consummation, and that all opposition seems vain. He distrusted the assurances given him by Charles and Ferdinand that they would support the papacy, and reported that only the Dukes of Bavaria and of Brunswick were to be relied upon.[1]

Under these general movements the question of indulgences, of course, took a subordinate position. Archbishop Albert of Mainz had at first so little conception of the situation that when Luther's theses appeared he commenced a prosecution against him and extended Tetzel's commission to Prussia and the Mark, only commanding that the indulgence be preached honorably and that the expenses, then amounting to three hundred gulden a month, be diminished.[2] The rising popular agitation, however, destroyed all prospect of future profits, and the sale of the indulgence was abandoned, leaving Albert's financial perplexities unrelieved. He learned nothing from this, however, and in 1521, after the Edict of Worms and while Luther was silent in the Wartburg, he organized another speculation of the same kind. His cathedral at Magdeburg had a priceless collection of relics—among them the body of St. Maurice, a jug from the marriage at Cana and the basin in which Pilate washed his hands. His predecessor, Ernest of Saxony, had transferred these to the cathedral which he built at Halle and had added to them, while Albert himself had shown his piety in liberal purchases of similar articles. A great pilgrimage to venerate them and gain indulgences was a not unpromising plan, and an annual solemnity of the kind, to continue forever on the Sunday after the Nativity of Mary (September 8th), was proclaimed. As a *legatus natus*, Albert could only grant an indulgence of seven years, which was trivial in comparison with the promises of the quæstuarii, but he shrewdly confined himself

---

[1] Dittrich, Nunciaturberichte Giovanni Morones, pp. 80, 81, 96, 105, 106–7, 134, 138, 153.—Lämmer, Monumenta Vaticana, pp. 288–9.—Cf. Consil. Johannis Cochlæi (Le Plat, Monument. C. Trident. II. 660–4).

[2] Gröne, Tetzel und Luther, pp. 198–9.

to generalities, and proclaimed that whoever would come with contrite heart to utter a prayer and give his "alms" should gain a most excellent indulgence for the remission of his sins. The scheme evidently was a failure, for Luther, who breathed vengeance on hearing of it in the Wartburg, after his return to Wittenberg, wrote on December 1st to Albert, threatening him with the publication of a tract written on the subject, when the archbishop meekly replied that the scheme had already been abandoned.[1]

While indulgences thus had declined in popular estimation, they did not disappear entirely from view in the controversies of the period. It is true that there is no allusion to them in the enumeration of Luther's heresies contained in the Edict of Worms, but the *Gravamina* of Nürnberg, in 1522, fiercely reiterate all the complaints against them. The only result of this vigorous protest was a constitution of reform, issued July 7, 1524, by the Legate Campeggio, after consultation with Ferdinand and the princes at Ratisbon. In this the clause respecting indulgences provides that the local pardoners must bear letters from the Ordinaries of the dioceses, who are urged to grant them only to proper persons; they are not to make bargains as to division of profits and are to swear that they will not squander the proceeds in foul living, but the Mendicant preachers commissioned by the pope are to be in no way restricted.[2] As these latter gentry were the ones chiefly obnoxious, it is evident that as yet Rome had learned nothing and was not disposed to abate a jot of her privileges. There was, in fact, no disposition to abandon so useful an adjunct to the power of the keys. When, in 1530, the growth of Lutheranism in Italy was alarming, plenary indulgence and remission of all sins were promised to all members of confraternities swearing to aid the Inquisition, and also the Stations of Rome daily for visiting five altars and reciting five Paters and Aves.[3] Even more significant was the plenary bestowed by the legate on the occasion of the election of Ferdinand as king of the Romans in 1531, when all present, 40,000 in number, gained it by taking communion, except the son of the Duke of Saxony, whom Charles V. consequently drove from his presence as a heretic.[4]

[1] A. Wolters, Hat Cardinal Albrecht von Mainz im Jahre 1521 den Tetzel'schen Ablasshandel erneuert? (Bonn, 1877).

[2] Le Plat, Monument. C. Trident. II. 232. [3] Amort de Indulgent. I. 79.

[4] Lämmer, Meletematum Romanorum Mantissa, p. 203.

Paul III., on his elevation to the pontificate in 1534, made a promising beginning, apparently in the nature of a general revocation of indulgences, the details of which I have not been able to ascertain. It is doubtless to this that reference is made in a project of reform presented to him soon afterwards, which argues that indulgences should not be abrogated, because, if abuses have existed, they should not be imputed to the grantor, and that under the present pope they have been effectually removed and new concessions have been sparingly made[1] More elaborate was the "Consilium de emendanda Ecclesia" drawn up in 1538, after two years' labor, by a commission of nine prelates, at the head of which was Caraffa (afterward Paul IV.) and comprising such men as Cardinals Contarini, Sadoleto, and Reginald Pole. This denounced, as a disgrace to the Holy See and a disturbance of the people, all employment of the power of the keys for money; the quæstuarii who deceive peasants and simple folk and teach them innumerable superstitions should be suppressed; indulgences should be granted only once a year, and then only in the chief cities, and commutation of vows should only be made for some equivalent good work.[2] Contarini, moreover, in a defence of the *Consilium* addressed to Paul III. denies the capacity of the pope to sell the power of the keys or to use it for profit, no matter how good may be the object, for the dispenser cannot sell what is not his but God's.[3] All this promised well, as though the Church was at last learning the lesson so rudely thrust upon it by Germany, but the futility of all Paul III.'s professions of amendment is manifested in a bull for St. Peter's issued by him in 1542. The customary supplies from north of the Alps had been cut off, and the pinch was severely felt.[4] The commissioners in charge of St. Peter's asked for assistance, and he issued a bull reciting those of Julius II. and Leo X., adding that it was doubted by many whether they were included in the general revocation proclaimed on his accession. He now empowers confra-

[1] Döllinger, Beiträge zur politischen, kirchlichen und Culturgeschichte, III. 233.

[2] Le Plat, Monum. C. Trident. II. 602–3.

[3] Ibid. pp. 606–7.

[4] In 1539 Morone says that in the three years of his nunciature the Holy See had not drawn from Germany enough to cover his expenses and those of the Legate Aleander. — Dittrich, Nunciaturberichte Giovanni Morones, p. 26. Evidently the Catholics as well as the Lutherans had liberated themselves.

ternities to be formed everywhere, the members of which, on entering within three years and paying the sum prescribed by the commissioners, shall enjoy the plenary indulgence for themselves and for souls in purgatory promised for assistance to St. Peter's, together with the jubilee, plenary remission of sins at death, and participation in the spiritual works of the Church Universal. In the Spanish dominions, visiting churches on three feasts, intending to confess at the times prescribed by the Church, and paying the sum designated will obtain the hundred-year jubilee and Holy Land indulgence. Furthermore, Paul peremptorily suppresses the operations of certain hospitals, including the Santo Spirito in Saxia, with St. John Lateran, St. James, the monasteries of St. Sebastian and the Orders of St. Augustin and Merced, which, in spite of his revocation, have not blushed to publish their indulgences and make collections under them.[1]

It is evident from this that there was no intention on the part of the Holy See to forego the sale of indulgences as a source of revenue or to adopt the opinion of Cardinal Contarini respecting the use for profit of the power of the keys. At the same time there was a growing sense of the incongruity of the methods current in their disposal —methods almost inevitable when it was a business carried on by unscrupulous agents whose sole object was to raise money by speculating on the fears of the timid or the superstition of the ignorant. After many delays and tergiversations the long-promised universal council was called together at Trent to effect the reform demanded by all Christendom, and Europe paused in expectancy of the result. From 1545 to 1547 it sat, occupied mostly with defining points of faith suggested by scholastic theology and rendering impossible the reunion with the Protestants, which had been one of the chief objects of its convocation. A few minor reforms were adopted, among which was one, June 17, 1546, prohibiting quæstuarii from preaching, either personally or by deputy.[2] That it was not intended by this to put an end to the trade of the pardoners is shown by a proposed bull of reform, dated No-

[1] Pauli PP. III. Const. *Dum ad universas*, 1542 (Bullar. I. 751).—The restraint placed on the hospitals cannot have been serious, for the next year Paul erected a confraternity for the hospital for converted Jews and Moors, and endowed it with all the indulgences of St. Peter's, Santo Spirito, St. James, and half a dozen others.—Const. *Illius*, 1543 (Ibid. p. 767).

[2] C. Trident. Sess. V. De Reform. Cap. 2.

vember 22, 1546, and sent by Paul III. to the council, but never promulgated, in which the only allusion to indulgences is a clause empowering the bishops to restrain the scandals of commissioners and quæstuarii.[1] The demand for more effective measures of reform by the imperial ambassadors and the German bishops became inconveniently pressing, and in March, 1547, Paul III. transferred the council to Bologna, on the pretext of pestilence at Trent. The Germans and Spaniards refused to follow, and, after a few months of inactivity, the council of Bologna dispersed informally and was no longer heard of. During its existence, however, it adopted some decrees, which, although never recognized by the Church, are of interest as showing that the old abuses in the sale of indulgences were still flourishing unchecked. It deplored the great damage to the Church and the honor of God arising from practices in some places, which it ordered to cease. The greatest was the execrable custom of compelling poor peasants and workmen, against their will, to attend on workdays at the publication of indulgences, when, not through piety, but under its pretext, they were forced to take them, or through fraud and the abuse of excommunication to give their names and promise to pay the required sum. Farming out indulgences and contracts respecting them, whether by laymen or ecclesiastics, were forbidden; both parties to such bargains were to incur excommunication, and all indulgences so managed were revoked. Compositions for ill-gotten gains were also denounced; faculties to that effect were no longer to be granted and existing ones to be so limited that the whole amount in question must be paid. The freedom to choose a confessor, customarily granted with indulgences, was only to be conceded for great and urgent causes, and as well as licences to eat forbidden food during fasts. Bishops in their visitations were directed to investigate all indulgences and the use made of the proceeds, even in the case of exempt religious houses; those which had expired or the causes of which had ceased were to be annulled and all frauds to be suppressed and punished, and provincial councils were likewise directed to perform this duty.[2] This salutary but fruitless legislation renders it evident that the evils of the existing system were clearly known and appreciated by the pope and his advisers.

[1] Printed by Clausen, Copenhagen, 1829, p. 21.

[2] Raynald. Annal. ann. 1547, n. 68.

Yet it is difficult to credit the council of Bologna with a simple desire to reform these evils. The decree was rather a political blow aimed at Charles V., with whom the relations of the Holy See at the time were greatly strained. The practices complained of were then especially flourishing in the Spanish dominions and were a source of large revenue to the Spanish treasury. We have seen the struggle between Charles and Pope Adrian over the *cruzada*, and that the pope had been obliged to content himself with the paltry sum of 20,000 ducats a year as his share of the proceeds. The concession of the cruzada was for three years, and the scruples of Paul III. had not prevented him from renewing it as often as necessary, especially as the portion for St. Peter's continued to be paid.[1] The profits to the state were estimated, in 1525, by the Venetian envoy at 500,000 ducats for three years, or about 170,000 per annum; in 1551 at 120,000 ducats per annum, and in 1563 at 1,000,000 ducats for the three years, clear of all expenses, including the 20,000 a year to St. Peter's.[2] It was not a bad stroke of policy to threaten to interfere with so large a source of income, and in fact Paul IV., on his accession in 1555, suspended the cruzada in order to weaken Spain for the war which he was preparing to wage with Philip II.[3]

It is easy to see how the decree of the council was aimed directly at Spain, as we have the records showing the methods pursued there, and a glance at them will exhibit the practices in vogue to raise money by the exploitation of the spiritual treasure of the Church. Composition for ill-gotten gains, as we have seen, was a productive feature of the cruzada, and so was the *Bula de Lacticinios*, or permission to eat milk-food in Lent. The abusive devices to compel purchase of the plenary indulgence had long been the subject of remonstrances. As early as 1348 and 1380 the Córtes of Castile petitioned Alfonso XI. and Juan I. to put a stop to the oppression by which the preachers of Holy Land indulgences forced the people to attend their sermons, to the destruction of labor, and devised other ingenious means of extortion, whereupon both monarchs adopted the effective measure of revoking the commissions of the collectors. The evil was ineradicable; Ferdinand and Isabella, in their comprehensive legislation of

[1] Perez de Lara, Compendio de las tres Gracias, p. 5.
[2] Relazioni Venete Serie I. T. II. pp. 41, 196; T. V. p. 25.
[3] Perez de Lara, p. 5.—Relazioni Venete, Serie I. T. III. p. 340; T. V. p. 22.

1480, were obliged to enact that no one should be forced to purchase the pardons or be subjected to vexations and oppression, a law so completely disregarded that the Córtes of Castile, in 1523, and again in 1525, complained of its non-observance and petitioned for its re-enactment.[1] During the interval the Córtes of Catalonia, in 1512 and 1520, reiterated the complaints of enforced attendance at the sermons, of extorting "alms" and of other vexations; they begged that the officials should be obliged to swear to observe the reforms which were promised, and should be punished for transgressions; especially they asked, without success, for abrogation of the immunity which rendered these officials justiciable only by the Commissioner-General of the Cruzada, and that they should be subjected to episcopal jurisdiction. They obtained, however, the concession that the preachers and their retinues should not be entitled to free-quarters, but should pay fair prices for lodging and victuals.[2] In 1524 Charles V. issued a *pragmática* forbidding the preachers and treasurers from interfering unnecessarily with the labors of the people, from punishing them for non-attendance at the sermons, from compelling them to take the *bulas* against their will, from forcing them to go beyond the bounds of their towns or parishes in accompanying the bull on its arrival and departure, and from oppressing them in any manner.[3] All this legislation was fruitless in obtaining relief. In 1525 the Venetian envoy, Gasparo Contarini, tells us that the greatest cruelty and tyranny were exercised in forcing the poor peasantry to buy the indulgences; if they declined they were compelled to attend the preaching so persistently that they could not earn a living; and in 1528 the Córtes was forced to ask for the re-enactment of the *pragmática* of 1525.[4] Still more shameless were the frauds by which the officials frequently imposed on the illiterate by giving purchasers other bulls than the right ones, or printed papers of other kinds. In 1554 Philip II. sought to put an end to these practices, but the remedies proposed were purely nugatory.[5] So

[1] Nueva Recopilación, Ley 1, Tit. ix. Lib. I.

[2] Pragmaticas y altres Drets de Cathalunya, Lib. I. Tit. ix. Cap. 2, 3, 4 (pp. 24-7). These reforms were granted by Leo X., in 1516, in the bull *Pastoris officii* (Ib. p. 20).

[3] Novísima Recopilación, Ley 6, Tit. xi. Lib. II.

[4] Relazioni, Serie I. T. II. pp. 41, 42.—Novísima Recopilación, *loc. cit.*

[5] Novísima Recopilación, Ley 8, Tit. xi. Lib. II. In 1555 Dr. Diego Perez,

flagrant and notorious, in fact, were the abuses connected with the cruzada that when, in 1555, Charles V. applied to Melchor Cano for an opinion with regard to his quarrel with Paul IV., in which it was withdrawn, the stern theologian argued that this was a benefit rather than an injury; the monarch, it is true, was deprived of money, but his conscience was relieved of one of its heaviest burdens arising from the offences to God committed in the publication and sale of the indulgence.[1]

One of the worst features of the system, hinted at in the decree of the council of Bologna, was the sale of the indulgences on credit. As Paolo Tiepolo, in 1563, says, men were forced to buy, not only by the exhortations of the preachers, but by the fear of not being reckoned good Christians. There is, he tells us, scarce any one found so poor or so obstinate as not to take the bulls, and those who cannot raise the two *reales* in cash are given credit, but when once they have entered on the engagement it must be met, for every effort and every rigor are employed in the collection.[2] The obligation, in fact, was relentlessly enforced and gave rise to an infinite amount of extortion on the helpless, for the treasurer had to pay for the bulls, whether he collected the money or not, and it was necessary that he should have ample power to protect himself. It was in vain that the Córtes of Catalonia, in 1520, petitioned that the sale of indulgences on credit should be abandoned. The request was refused, and the only relief accorded was that payment should no longer be enforced by casting an interdict on the whole parish of the insolvent debtor, a provision which was extended to the rest of Spain by Charles V. in 1524.[3] The substitute for this was scarce less rigorous.

professor of canon law at Salamanca, thus describes the methods of the "quæstors," who, he says, were all ecclesiastics—"Isti quæstores spe lucri maximas extorsiones, violationes et inductiones non vere sæpe, solent facere: et sic involuntarii et coacti ut in plurimum, præsertim agricultores rustici fateri, vidimus eos recipisse, quod dolendum est de ipsis quæstoribus."—Gloss. in Ordenanzas Reales, Ley 2, Tit. viii. Lib. I.

[1] Llorente, Coleccion Diplomatica, p. 12.—"Porque este sin duda lo pudo hacer sin perjudicar á nadie y con buena intencion, atento á los abusos y ofensas de Dios que en la predicacion y execucion de ella hay; y fuere sanamente hecho, y muy á servicio de V. M. porque le quitára dineros, pero tambien le quitára uno de los mayores cargos de consciencia que V. M. tiene sobre si."

[2] Relazioni, Serie I. T. V. p. 24.

[3] Pragmáticas etc. de Cathalunya, Lib. I. Tit. IX. Cap. 4, §§ 4, 6 (p. 27).—Novísima Recopilación, Ley 6, Tit. 21, Lib. II.

A royal order of 1554 describes the methods by which the unfortunate debtors were stripped of their little property: by way of reform it prescribes a plan which, if an improvement, only shows how merciless the previous procedure must have been. For these deferred payments the *concejo*, or town-council, was directed to appoint a collector who was required, within forty days after the expiration of the term of credit, to pay to the treasurer of the cruzada the amount of all the bulls placed in his hands for collection. For this he was clothed with full power to coerce the debtors, to levy on their property and to sell it. If some of the debtors proved to be too poor to pay even under this duress, or if any had been entered twice or could not be found, or if, at the appointed time, the collector did not pay the required sum to the treasurer, the latter was instructed to proceed against him with the most rigorous measures known to the law, and the town-council was required to make good any deficiency. Although the collector was entitled to a fee of one maravedí for every bull collected, his responsibility for the bad debts contracted by the preachers rendered his office so unattractive, that there was a provision that no one could be compelled to serve for two successive years, and he was also exempted from the obligation of assuming any other office, from the liability to furnish free-quarters and from some other burdens. Under a law of 1524, which continued in force, no fees or commissions were chargeable for seizing and selling the goods; no article was to be taken worth more than double the amount of the debt; the sale took place at auction in the town of the debtor, in presence of the alcaide or public scrivener; no official connected with the seizure could be a purchaser, and if the sale realized more than the debt the surplus was to be restored to the owner.[1] As all this was pious work for the saving of souls it was purely spiritual business, and whenever the secular courts

[1] Novísima Recopilación, Leyes 6, 8, Tit. xi. Lib. II.—Perez de Lara, pp. 74, 75.

In 1608 a circular to the royal corregidores states that the treasurers of the *cruzada* complain that many bulls remain unpaid for, although the term of credit and the forty days allowed to the collectors have expired, wherefore steps must be taken at once to collect the amount due for all bulls on the register of credit sales not yet accounted for. To this end the persons and property of the collectors, and, if this is insufficient, the property of the town-councillors, are to be seized and put up at auction, all expenses being at the charge of the town-councils.—Perez de Lara, p. 94.

endeavored to extend their jurisdiction over the *cruzada* they were told not to interfere.[1]

This cruel eagerness to exploit to the utmost the power of the keys and the treasure of the Church was perhaps more crudely developed in Spain than elsewhere, because there the State obtained the main share of the proceeds and lent its power to swell the gains. But in other lands, and especially where indulgences were farmed out or the pardoners had a direct interest in the extent of their sales, we may be sure that methods of a similar nature were employed in so far as the local laws would permit, and that spiritual pressure was brought to bear when legal coercion was impossible. This explains the complaints of exactions and oppression by papal commissioners, such as Bishop Arcemboldi, while in France a royal edict of 1538 shows that the State did not hesitate to intervene to protect its subjects from the frauds and rapacity of the pardon-sellers.[2] It was quite time that the Church should make a serious attempt to redeem itself from the reproach of complicity in such prostitution of the powers which it claimed to have received from Christ for the redemption of man.

[1] Nueva Recopilación, Leyes 8, 9, Tit. x. Lib. I.—Novísima Recopilación, Leyes 2, 3, 4, 5, Tit. xi. Lib. II.

[2] Isambert, Anciennes Loix Françaises, XIII. 551.—In spite of this they continued to ply their trade as recklessly as ever. See Concil. Narbonens. ann. 1551, Cap. 58 (Harduin. X. 464); Synod. Parisiens. ann. 1557 (Bochelli Decret. Eccles. Gallican. p. 983).

Paul Lang in the *Chron. Citizense* ann. 1484 (Pistorii Rer. Germ. Scriptt. I. 1255) describes how a papal legate went to Sweden with a plenary indulgence and plucked the poor people there with insatiable greed, whereupon the local author from whom he transcribes the account exclaims "O Petre, Petre, non tibi dixit Christus Mulge aut Tonde, sed Pasce, Pasce."

CHAPTER VIII.

THE COUNTER-REFORMATION.

The battle of Mühlberg, in 1547, seemed for a time to sound the knell of Lutheranism. Charles V. at last was the master of Germany, to all appearances free to impose his will on the vanquished. Disgusted with the futile results of the council of Trent and the transfer of its papalist members to Bologna, he broke with the Holy See and resolved to carry out his projects of reform within the empire. His measures to this effect may be regarded as the commencement of the counter-Reformation. At the Diet of Augsburg, in 1548, he caused the adoption of the project known as the *Interim* to settle the religious questions until the final definitions of the interrupted universal council, and also a Formula of Reformation to restore the corrupted discipline of the Church. To enforce the latter he caused a series of provincial councils to be assembled, which in their several ways did what they could to effect the object. The only interest which these comprehensive efforts have for our present subject is to show how completely the question of indulgences had fallen out of sight in Germany, for there is no allusion to them in either of the measures. The Interim naturally admits the power of the keys, the sacrament of penance and absolution, and prayers and masses for the dead, but says nothing as to the treasure or its application, while in the Formula of Reformation indulgences are not enumerated among the works of piety which the faithful are exhorted to practise, nor is anything said as to their abuse.[1] Apparently it was deemed wisest to treat them as non-existent. Yet, in 1557, a memorial prepared by Georg Witzel for the Emperor Ferdinand, respecting a proposed reunion with the Lutherans, shows that the abuses of penitence and indulgences still continued.[2]

---

[1] Interim Cap. IX. n. 6, Cap. XVII., Cap. XXIV.; Formulæ Reformat. Cap. VIII. (Goldast. Constt. Imp. I. 523, 526, 533–4; II. 326).

[2] In pœnitentia conceditur illis indulgentiæ fœda nundinatio, et nescio quid de chartis butyraceis. Quin conceditur illis etiam excommunicationis pecu-

A new pontiff, Julius III., yielded to the urgency of Charles, and in November, 1550, issued a call for the reassembling of the council of Trent on May 1, 1551. The prelates were slow in assembling, and it was not until October 11th that a session was held for business. The sudden revolt of Maurice of Saxony and the triumphant campaign of Henry II. rendered Charles powerless for the time, and the council eagerly seized the opportunity, April 28, 1552, to suspend itself for two years, having accomplished little of its task of reform. The two years and more passed away, and it was not till November, 1560, that Pius IV. issued a summons for its reconvocation at the following Easter. The prelates, as usual, assembled slowly, and the council was formally opened January 18, 1562. At length in July the subject of indulgences was reached, and a decree was adopted reciting the fruitless efforts made in the councils of Lateran, Lyons, and Vienne to suppress the abuses of the pardoners which had continued to increase to the scandal of the faithful, so that there was no hope left of their amendment. Their employment was therefore strictly forbidden for the future, and indulgences were ordered to be published at fitting times by the Ordinary of each place, assisted by two of the canons, who were to serve gratuitously in receiving the "alms" and offerings of the faithful, so that all might understand that these celestial treasures were employed not for gain, but as an incentive to piety.[1] This was a decided move in the right

---

niariæ abrogatio, qui abusus in pœnitentia sacramentali deterrimus omnium sententia fuit."—Döllinger, Beiträge zur politischen, etc. III. 177.

[1] C. Trident. Sess. XXI. De Reform. Cap. 9.—"Quum multa a diversis antea conciliis, tam Lateranensi ac Lugdunensi quam Viennensi, adversus pravos eleemosynarum quæstorum abusus remedia tunc adhibita posterioribus temporibus reddita fuerint inutilia, potiusque eorum malitia ita quotidie magno fidelium omnium scandalo et querela excrescere deprehendatur, ut de eorum emendatione nulla spes amplius relicta videatur; statuit ut posthac in quibuscunque Christianæ religionis locis eorum nomen atque usus penitus aboleatur, nec ad officium hujusmodi exercendum ullatenus admittantur; nonobstantibus privilegiis ecclesiis, monasteriis, hospitalibus, piis locis et quibusvis cujuscunque gradus status et dignitatis personis concessis, aut consuetudinibus etiam immemorabilibus. Indulgentias vero aut alias spirituales gratias, quibus non ideo Christi fideles decet privari, deinceps per ordinarios locorum, adhibitis duobus de capitulo, debitis temporibus populo publicandas esse decernit. Quibus etiam eleemosynas atque oblata sibi caritatis subsidia, nulla prorsus mercede accepta, fideliter colligendi facultas datur, ut tandem cœlestes hos

direction, though as it still permitted indulgences to be sold and inferred that they could be obtained only by money payments, it only removed some of the developments of the evil principle without abrogating the principle itself, and it might have puzzled the good fathers to explain how indulgences were thus proved to be issued through piety and not for gain.

A more definite utterance was desired by a considerable section of the council, but opinions were divided and a prolonged contest was carried on. The legate, Cardinal Morone, representing the Holy See, was opposed to any further action or discussion, while the Cardinal of Lorraine, representing France, at the head of a large number of bishops, insisted on it as necessary to prevent the spread of heretic error, and even threatened Morone with the calling of a new council for the purpose if nothing more were done. For nine months he and the Conde de Luna, the ambassador of Spain, labored to have the matter publicly discussed by the theologians, but Morone skilfully eluded their demands. At the very last moment, just as the council was hurriedly breaking up, a decree was brought forward, which excited fresh dissension. Among the reforms proposed by the council of Bologna, in 1547, was one forbidding the affixing of a stated price for indulgences, which was rightly regarded as the root of most of the current abuses; it abolished all such and demanded that the payment should be spontaneous and in accordance with the devotion of

---

ecclesiæ thesauros non ad quæstum sed ad pietatem exerceri omnes vere intelligant."

It was doubtless under stimulus of the council that, in 1562, Pius IV. undertook to reduce the charges for bulls of indulgence. As he dispenses the treasure gratuitously, so he expects his officials to do the same. He therefore orders the vice-chancellor and his deputy, the summistæ, scriptores, rescribendarius, computator, receptor, defensores, secretaries of apostolic letters, abbreviators, solicitors, masters of the seal and register, collectors, registrars, bullators and their clerks, and the other officials of the curia, under pain of major excommunication and loss of six months' revenue, to expedite gratuitously all letters of indulgence except those containing the clause *porrectionis manuum adjutricum* (implying the sale of the indulgence for money), and also except that the writers and masters of the seal may charge the regular fee for ordinary signatures.—Amort de Indulg. I. 41.

This enumeration of the various officials through whose hands passed the papal briefs suggests the amount of tribute exacted in one way or another from the faithful.

the applicant.[1] A clause of the same nature was introduced in the proposed decree, and raised a fresh storm. The Conde de Luna protested against it as directed especially against the cruzada, which, as we have seen, was sold at the fixed price of two reales. In fact, it was the abuses connected with the cruzada which served as the staple argument of those in the council who demanded reform, and the papacy earnestly besought Philip II. to put a check to them in order to silence the clamor of the fathers; with this object the pope had revoked the St. Peter's bull in Italy and elsewhere, and if he allowed it to continue in Spain he desired it to be conducted with the utmost circumspection.[2] The income from the sale of the cruzada, however, was too important to be trifled with, and Philip was deaf to the exhortation. It was apparently to punish his obstinacy that the framers of the decree followed the example of the council of Bologna and inserted a clause forbidding fixed prices for indulgences. Against this the protest of the Conde de Luna was effectual, yet when the vote was taken on striking it out twenty bishops recorded themselves against the change, the majority of whom were Spaniards.[3]

---

[1] Raynald. Annal. ann. 1547, n. 68. "Præterea ut avaritiæ, quæ radix omnium malorum esse solet, ostium occludatur, statuit sancta Synodus . . . a nemine, neque ab executoribus quidem statuatur certa aliqua pecuniæ summa exsolvenda, sed quilibet libere donet quod pro sua pietate et devotione malit. . . . Quæ autem hactenus aliter quacunque ex causa concessæ vel a quocunque taxatæ sunt, hoc modo moderatæ esse censeantur."

[2] In October, 1563, two months before the final action, S. Carlo Borromeo writes to Visconti, Bishop of Vintimiglia, papal envoy to Philip II. on the affairs of the council—"Già molte volte Sua Santità ha fatto far conscienza al Vescovo di Cuenca Confessore [commissario?] dell' Indulgenze della cruciata che si fanno pigliare ab invitis; Sua Santita desidera che voi faciate di nuovo questo uffìcio, non solo col predetto Sgr. Vescovo, ma con ogni altri che bisognerà, e sebbene forse con S. Maestà propria, et poiche la Cruciata deve ormai esser formita. Il medesimo si dice delle Indulgenze della Fabbrica di San Pietro, le quali poiche Nostro Signore por rispetto di S. Maestà non ha voluto rivocare in Spagna, se ben l'ha rivocato in Italia et in tutti gli altri luoghi, deveno almeno essere usate con quella equità e circumspettione che conviene tanto più per non dar che dire et gridare in Concilio, dove i Padri ne haverebbero fatti più volte risentimento se non possero stati divertiti da chi porta affezzione alle cose di Sua Maestà."—Lämmer, Meletematum Roman. Mantissa, p. 193.

[3] Theiner, Acta genuina Concil. Trident. II. 680 (Zagrabiæ, 1874).—Lettere di Calini (Baluz. et Mansi, Miscell. IV. 349).—Epistt. Nuntii Vicecomitis (Ibid.

In the shape thus hastily adopted at the last session of the council, December 4, 1563, the decree recites that, as the power of conferring indulgences had been granted by Christ to the Church, and had been used from the most ancient times, the council teaches and orders that their use, which is most salutary for the people, shall be retained, and it condemns with the anathema those who assert that they are useless or that the Church has no power to grant them. In granting them, however, it desires the ancient and approved moderation to be observed, lest by too great facility ecclesiastical discipline shall be weakened. Desiring to correct the abuses which have crept in, through which the lofty name of indulgences is blasphemed by the heretics, it decrees the abolition of all the vicious means of gain that have been the chief source of abuses. Other corruptions arising from superstition, ignorance, irreverence, or otherwise, on account of their multitude and the places where they occur, cannot conveniently be specially prohibited, wherefore the council orders all bishops diligently to investigate them and report them in the first provincial synod, so that, with the judgment of the other bishops, they may be referred to the pope, by whose authority and prudence shall be decided what is expedient for the Church universal, so that indulgences may be piously and incorruptly dispensed to the people.[1]

III. 440, 474, 475, 482, 483, 484, 485).—Pallavicini Hist. C. Trident. Lib. XXIV. Cap. viii. n. 1, 7.

Mendoza, Bishop of Salamanca, in his account of the matter is discreetly silent about the clause stricken out.—Döllinger, Ungedruckte Berichte, II. 170 (Nördlingen, 1876).

[1] C. Trident. Sess. XXV. Contin. Decr. *De Indulgentiis.*—"Quum potestas conferendi indulgentias a Christo ecclesiæ concessa sit, atque hujusmodi potestate divinitus sibi tradita antiquissimis etiam temporibus illa usa fuerit, sacrosancta synodus indulgentiarum usum, Christiano populo maxime salutarem et sacrorum conciliorum auctoritate probatum, in ecclesia retinendum esse docet et præcipit, eosque anathemate damnat qui aut inutiles esse asserunt, vel eas concedendi in ecclesia potestatem esse negant. In his tamen concedendis moderationem juxta veterem et probatam in ecclesia consuetudinem adhiberi cupit, ne nimia facilitate ecclesiastica disciplina enervetur. Abusus vero qui in his irrepserunt, et quorum occasione insigne hoc indulgentiarum nomen ab hæreticis blasphematur, emendatos ac correctos cupiens, præsenti decreto generaliter statuit, pravos quæstus omnes pro his consequendis, unde plurma in Christiano populo abusuum causa fluxit, omnino abolendos esse. Cæteros vero qui ex superstitione, ignorantia, irreverentia, aut aliunde quomodocumque provenerunt quum ob multiplices locorum et provinciarum, apud quas hi committuntur,

This decree is of importance as defining authoritatively the position of the Church on the subject. Prior to the Reformation it had been currently held in the schools that, as there had been no conciliar definition as to indulgences, they were freely open to discussion. Now it was adopted as a point of faith that they had been divinely conceded by Christ, and it was heresy to assert their inefficacy. There was an injunction to be moderate in their use—an injunction which, as we shall see, has never received the slightest attention—and an admission that laxity in this respect is damaging to discipline.[1] It is freely granted that abuses had sprung from inordinate greed of gain, but the council contented itself with a general prohibition which meant nothing, and shrank from the only cure which lay in forbidding all dispensation of the spiritual treasure for money. The local superstitions and corruptions which it admitted to exist it rather shielded by requiring for their suppression the cumbrous process of investigation by the bishop, consultation by a provincial council and reference to the Holy See. As a whole, therefore, the final action of the council seems designed not so much to abrogate existing abuses as to shift responsibility for them; the only substantial gain was the decree of the previous year, suppressing the pardoners, and this received tardy obedience.

The pecuniary success of indulgences depended so largely on their being hawked around among the people, with florid exaggerations of their virtues, that the institutions which had enjoyed large revenues from this source were naturally unwilling to forego its advantages. The pressure became so great that Paul IV. yielded to it as far as he dared, and, in 1565, he issued a decree to the effect that although

---

corruptelas commode nequeant specialiter prohiberi, mandat omnibus episcopis ut diligenter quisque hujusmodi abusus ecclesiæ suæ colligat, eosque in prima synodo provinciali referat, ut, aliorum quoque episcoporum sententia cognita, statim ad summum Romanum Pontificem deferantur, cujus auctoritate et prudentia quod universali ecclesiæ expediet statuatur, ut ita sanctarum indulgentiarum munus pie sancte ac incorrupte omnibus fidelibus dispensetur."

[1] The excessive multiplication of indulgences was recognized at the time as an evil. In a list of the reforms necessary to bring the heretics back to the fold, presented, in 1562, to the council by Sebastian, King of Portugal, is included the reduction in their number, the withdrawal of the privilege of transferring them and the abandonment of the myriads of years' remission promised in them. They should never exceed one-fourth of the *pœna* due by the sinner.—Le Plat, Monument. C. Trident. V. 86.

the council had abolished quæstuarii and forbidden their employment, still he confirmed and renewed the faculties of begging with indulgences which could be conveniently reconciled with the precepts of the council, thus leaving it to those concerned to decide what might be considered as permissible, and encouraging them to disregard the prohibition.[1] Under this protection the business, which presumably had never ceased, continued to flourish with all the old abuses and scandals. Azpilcueta, after quoting the Tridentine decree, describes the quæstuarii as flourishing as rankly as ever. They are licentious drunkards and gluttons, clerics or laymen disguised as such, who buy or farm from monasteries and hospitals their indulgences, so that they risk the loss or gain the profit. They are a curse to the land, extorting by lies or threats from the peasantry, and collecting their debts with heartless rapacity, lavishing censures and selling the very beds from under the debtors.[2] Below these again came the *stationarii*, who everywhere pervaded the land, carrying with them false relics and exploiting in every way the superstitious ignorance of the lower orders and promising the protection of saints in temporal as well as spiritual matters.[3] Pius IV. however died in

[1] Amort de Indulg. I. 212. "Licet in Tridentino statutum sit ut quæstores eleemosynarum eorumque nomen et usus deinceps aboleantur; Nos Indulgentias ac quæstuandi et alias facultates quæ præfato concilii decreto commode coaptari poterunt, quoad ea tantum quæ sunt in usu et decretis dicti concilii non repugnant, confirmamus et innovamus."

[2] Azpilcuetæ Comment. de Jobilæo, Notab. XXXI. n. 46.—A cautious allusion to the cruzada shows that he prudently desires not to have his censures applied to its vendors, of whom more anon.

[3] M. Medinæ Disputat. de Indulgentiis Cap. xxxviii.—"Eorum circulatorum imposturas (Stationarios appellant) qui rusticorum hominum simplicitate abutentes omnesque vicos, villas, pagos, angiportus, castella et oppida pervagantes, sanctorumque quorumdam, ut Valentini, Hisperti, Cornelii, Anastasii, Antonii etc. sanctitatem prædicantes, aliquid nummorum emungere conantur, dum huic aut illi, quo res familiaris sit auctior, aut quo greges pesto non vastantur, segetes grando non comminuat, quo hoc aut illo genere mortis non pereat, certissimum patrocinium promittunt, modo eis singulis annis aliquo munusculo demulceat."

For a vivid characterization of these wandering impostors see Sir David Lyndesay's "Satyre of the Thrie Estaits" (Early English Text Society's Ed. p. 453), and for further details Ciruelo, *Reprovacion de las Supersticiones* P. III. Cap. vii. and Del Rio, *Disquisit. Magicar.* Lib. I. Cap. iii. Q. 4, showing how elusive are the distinctions between the lawful and the unlawful in supernatural methods.

December, 1565, and was succeeded by the stern reformer, St. Pius V., who was determined, on the one hand, to suppress heresy by persecution and, on the other, to deprive it of pretext by purifying the Church. In February, 1567, accordingly he issued a *motu proprio*, in which he described in vigorous language how St. Peter's, the Lateran, S. Spirito in Saxia and many others, having indulgences and seeking only temporal gain rather than the salvation of the faithful, appointed quæstors, commissioners, procurators, receivers, treasurers, factors, messengers etc., and abused their indulgences to the offence of the Divine Majesty, the damage of their own souls and those of the faithful, the disturbance of the Ordinaries and the scandal of pious minds. Wherefore he revokes and annuls for all time all indulgences based upon lending the helping hand and containing the faculty of begging, and he prohibits under pain of his indignation every one, of whatever station, even episcopal or royal, from making collections or employing pardoners under pretext of indulgences heretofore or hereafter granted, unless there shall be a special derogation of this decree.[1]

This decisive action met with slow obedience, even in Italy. As late as 1596 the council of Aquileia found it necessary to order the

---

[1] S. Pii PP. V. Const. *Etsi Dominici gregis* (Bullar. II. 228–9).—Pius recites a number of institutions having indulgences and "multi quæstores ex eisdem indulgentiis lucrum temporale tantum quærentes nominibus fabricæ Ecclesiarum, Hospitalium . . . . et piorum locorum prædictorum in diversis civitatibus et diœcesibus quæstus facere, confratres describere, capellas et oratoria erigere, illisque erectis indulgentias hujusmodi communicare, et in diversis gradibus a jure prohibitis dispensare, ac plura etiam concedere quam eis vigore facultatum prædictarum licitum sit, ipsique lucro intenti, pecuniasque potius quam Christifidelium salutem quærentes, ac eisdem indulgentiis sic abutentes quæstum ex illis particularem facere conantur, variosque et diversos quæstores, commisarios, procuratores, receptores, thesaurarios, factores, nuntios et alios ministros constituere . . . et alias in pluribus graviter excedentes in divinæ majestatis offensam ac suarum et Christifidelium animarum perniciem ac Ordinariorum perturbationem et piorum mentium scandalum, præsumunt."

In 1577 Gregory XIII. restored all the indulgences thus swept away by Pius, substituting prayer and other pious works for the "helping hands."—Greg. PP. XIII. Bull. *Ut laudes.* (Bullar. T. VI. Append. p. 44).

Catholic writers are apt to assume (Green, Indulgences . . . . considered in reply to the charge of Venality, London, 1872, pp. 104, 132) that "eleemosynary" indulgences were thus abolished and have so remained; but this, as we shall see, is by no means the case.

indulgences thus annulled by Pius to be removed from the churches and other holy places [1] Elsewhere both it and the Tridentine decree were long practically ignored. Under the imperative commands of Philip II. the council of Trent was received in the Netherlands in 1565, but as late as 1607 we find the council of Mechlin ordering the publication of indulgences in the manner prescribed at Trent, and the suppression of the collection of "alms."[2] Although in France the council of Trent has never been formally received, owing to its encroachments on the sovereignty of the State, still Catherine de' Medici and her sons permitted the bishops to adopt its discipline in their dioceses. Yet various councils held towards the end of the century show that indulgences were still carried around and were issued to stimulate the liberality of the faithful.[3] Even as late as 1614 the Parlement of Paris was obliged to intervene when the Benedictines of Monserrat obtained permission from the Bishop of Le Mans to preach their indulgences in Maine; their quæstuarii were busy when the Parlement took the decisive action of expelling them from the kingdom and ordering the money collected to be used for the poor of the towns where it had been gathered.[4]

Spain, however, was the most conspicuous offender, although Philip II., after brief hesitation, had ordered the council of Trent to be published in his dominions. He had no intention, however, of allowing his profits from the cruzada to be curtailed by obeying its decrees. The *bulas* continued to be preached and sold by organized bands of quæstuarii, whose zeal to commit abuses was stimulated by the dependence of their pay on the amount of sales effected. In spite of this Pius IV., in 1563, renewed the concession for the customary three years. When this expired St. Pius V. was on the papal throne, and Philip's application for a renewal was met with a sting-

---

[1] C. Aquileiens. ann. 1596, Cap. 14 (Harduin. X. 1912–13).

Still the decree of Pius V. was not without its effect. Azpilcueta, in 1577 (De Oratione Cap. xxii. n. 78) says that through the weakness of human nature it had stopped the efforts to publish indulgences which bring in no temporal gain.

[2] C. Mechlenens. ann. 1607, Tit. VI. (Harduin. X. 1945).

[3] C. Rotomagens. ann. 1581, De Episc. Officio n. 36 (Harduin. X. 1234).—C. Aquens. ann. 1585, De Indulg. (Ibid. 1570–1).—C. Tolosan. ann. 1590, P. II. Cap. 12 (Ibid. 1806).—C. Avenionens. ann. 1594, Cap. 48 (Ibid. 1863).—C. Narbonens. ann. 1609, Cap. 12 (Ibid. XI. 12).

[4] Preuves des Libertez de l'Église Gallicane, II. 151.

ing rebuke. The pope replied that he had learned, from Spanish bishops and from cases coming to his knowledge, that the sale was attended with scandals, the mere mention of which was a disgrace. The officials in charge were paid by a commission on their sales, and to increase their gains used violence and extortion on the poor, which converted the spiritual grace into merchandise. They also employed preachers by paying them for each indulgence sold through their exertions; these preachers consequently labored in the pulpit to frighten the people with such threats of hell that it seemed as though no one could be saved without the bull, and they were popularly nicknamed *echan cornos*, because, through thirst of gain, they threatened excommunication and eternal perdition on all who did not purchase of them.[1] The pope was therefore intractable, although Philip was soon afterwards involved in a "holy war" of the most costly and dangerous kind through the rebellion of the Moriscos of Granada in 1568.[2] Thus deprived of the resource of the cruzada Philip adopted the expedient of a cumulative episcopal indulgence, already described (p. 176), in which his obedient prelates, with Cardinal Espinosa, the Inquisitor-General, at their head, joined without remonstrance. Pius V. of course was outraged when he heard of it; in January, 1570, he denounced it in the sharpest manner, pronounced the indulgences null and void, and threatened with the severest censures all who should take part in it, but the Spanish bishops disregarded his wrath; the customary machinery was set to work successfully, and though the pardon promised was so much less than that of the cruzada, we are told that the receipts were as large as usual. Doubtless this was to a great extent owing to the *bula de lacticinios*, allowing the use of eggs and milk-food during fasts—a privilege greatly prized in Spain, where fresh fish was not easily procurable in many parts of the land.[3]

---

[1] Leonardo Donato, Relazioni Venete, Serie I. T. VI. p. 380.

[2] Leonardo Donato (*loc. cit.* p 408) says that if the Turks had sent some galleys and troops to Spain, instead of declaring war against Venice, it would have kindled a conflagration difficult to quench. The Spanish court was fully alive to this danger (Janer, Condición Social de los Moriscos, pp. 56 sqq. Cf. Memorial Histórico Español, T. III. pp. 55–8).

[3] Perez de Lara, Exposicion de las tres Gracias, pp. 30–33.—S. Pii PP. V. Const. *Quam plenum*, 2 Jan. 1570 (Bullar. II. 323; Septimi Decretal. Lib. II. Tit. xv. Cap. 2).—"Ad hæc ipsi in dispensandis cœlestis gratiæ donis nimium prodigi, iis sic litteras prædictas accipientibus indulgentias et pœnitentiarum

This was a device which could scarce bear repetition without provoking an open schism, and Philip's desire for a renewal of the cruzada was not diminished. Before the year 1570 was out Pius was ardently bent on bringing him into the league of Venice and the papacy against the Turk. Philip made the concession of the cruzada a condition, and the convictions of Pius yielded to the temptation. It is quite probable that the glory of Lepanto quieted his conscience, as well as the fact that he successfully insisted on the abandonment of commissions on sales and the payment of the preachers by the number of indulgences sold, while apparently as a compensation for this, the purchasers were divided into two classes, the more wealthy of which paid a higher price.[1] Besides this he secured a larger share in the proceeds. The contribution to the fabric of St. Peter's had been, since the time of Adrian VI., 20,000 ducats per annum. In future the concessions were to be for six years, and it was agreed that during the first five years of each term the Holy See should receive 100,000 ducats per annum.[2] It thus became more than ever an accomplice in the abuses of the cruzada and in the contravention of the Tridentine decree, for though commissions were abolished, the indulgence continued to be carried around and preached in the old fashion with all its attendant features of rapacity and extortion. No interdict stopped the preaching of the bull, and no quarantine was allowed to prevent the entrance of its ministers. During the time of sale all begging and soliciting of money for pious uses were prohibited, except that from door to door of the mendicant friars and of recognized beggars.[3] The whole business was organized in the most thorough manner. In the last

---

injunctarum remissiones, nulla cum re temporali conferendas, profusius et indiscrete largiuntur, quibus et aliis licentiis prædictis non pauci fluctuantes et infirmi, veniæ facilitate inducti, ad peccandum procliviores fiunt, quando tot et tantorum delictorum remissionem certo et vilissimo pretio acquirere posse confidant . . . . Cum etiam inter cætera scandala etiam Simoniæ pravitas redoleat."

It would not be easy to condemn more forcibly the whole system of indulgences, nor could Pius readily reconcile these utterances with his subsequent action.

[1] For common folk the price was fixed at two *reales;* for men of rank and station, at eight.—Perez de Lara, pp. 69, 70

[2] Perez de Lara, pp. 6, 22.—Relazioni, Serie I. T. V. p. 25; T. VI p. 380.

[3] Perez de Lara, pp. 19, 21, 75.

year of each six years' concession bids were invited for the office of treasurer for the next six years, and these could either be at wholesale or at retail (*por mayor ó por menor*)—for the whole kingdom or for particular districts or bishopries. When the bids were opened the most advantageous were selected, and a second competition was invited for still better offers, thus putting the affair up to a sort of auction. The successful competitor was he who proposed, while accounting for all bulls sold at their face value, to defray all the expenses for the lowest sum. He paid the monasteries which had the printing contracts the price which they were allowed to charge for the bulls in blank; he provided the administration and hired the preachers; he divided his territory up into circuits of convenient size and engaged that the preaching should commence in each circuit every year as soon as the previous year's sales were closed; that there should be preaching in every village of more than seventy families; that it should be thoroughly finished by Palm Sunday, and settlement and payment be completed by the end of April in the following year, including all compositions and dispensations embraced in the grant of the cruzada. He was subject to a fine of thirty ducats for every village omitted; he was required to keep an adequate supply of all the varieties of bulls in every place, and when the preachers left it the parish priest was charged to announce at mass on every feast day during the remainder of the year the spot, usually in the church, where the bulls were for sale, enlarging on their advantages and their importance for the souls of the faithful. For any remissness in this duty the negligent pastor incurred excommunication and a fine of fifty ducats. If sales were lost through an insufficient supply of bulls in any place, the treasurer forfeited thirty ducats and had to pay for the sales thus missed at the estimation of the priest. The credit system was continued with the sharp remedies for insolvent purchasers described above. No bulls could be returned after being once sold and delivered, and any official taking one back suffered excommunication and a fine of thirty ducats, besides incurring disability for further service in the cruzada. No one, however, was to be employed in the business who was not an upright and God-fearing man. While on duty they were entitled to free quarters, and the local officials were ordered to see that they were well treated. After the preaching a delegate of the Commissioner-General was required to investigate each district and satisfy

himself that it had been done in every village and that a sufficiency of bulls had been deposited there, and his certificate to this effect was a necessary voucher in auditing the accounts of the treasurer.[1]

The trifling changes prescribed by St. Pius V. seem only to have brought about a system in which the cruzada was more profitable than ever. In 1573 the estimate of Leonardo Donato is 350,000 ducats per annum, and, in 1575, Lorenzo Priuli says that the extension of the cruzada to the New World by Gregory XIII. had resulted in an increase of 500,000 ducats a year, showing that the Indians and colonists had been industriously exploited.[2] In 1584 Vincenzo Gradenigo estimates the cruzada of Spain alone at 600,000 ducats.[3] To these sums are to be added the 100,000 ducats paid to

---

[1] Perez de Lara, pp. 36, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 105-7.

[2] Relazioni Serie I. T. V. p. 233; T. VI. p. 378. In the Indies the indulgences ran for two years in place of one; the price to Spaniards, from viceroys down to persons worth 10,000 pesos, was two pesos (sixteen reales); for others, one peso or eight reales, except monks, friars, beggars, and serving-men, for whom it was two reales, to be paid in coin or bullion where they were obtainable. Indians could settle with the equivalent in merchandise; their caciques paid one peso, the rest two reales.—Perez de Lara, p. 81.

The cruzada had been organized in the Indies at an early period, but had been withdrawn from there by Pius IV. in 1563 (Perez de Lara, p. 5). It gave rise to quite a body of laws duly preserved in the *Recopilación de Leyes de los Reinos de Indias*. Even as early as the time of Charles V. it became necessary to prohibit oppression of the Indians, forcing them to attend the sermons against their will, or paying for the indulgence out of the treasuries of the pueblos (Ibid. Leyes 10, 11, Tit. xx. Lib. I.). The character of the officials engaged in the business is illustrated, in 1634, by the treasurer in Manilla withholding the funds and using them in trade, which led to a regulation forbidding treasurers to engage in traffic (Ibid. Ley 24).

In 1594 we find St. Toribio, Archbishop of Lima, spurred by a letter from Philip II., exhorting the priests to stimulate the sale of the cruzada among their parishioners, and basing it partly on the spiritual benefits of the indulgence and partly on the needs of the royal treasury.—Synod. Liman. ann. 1594, Cap. 22 (Haroldus, Lima Limata, pp. 323, 342).

About a hundred years ago Moreau de Saint-Méry, in his "Description de la Partie Espagnole de l'Isle de Saint-Dominique" (T. II. pp. 51-3) gives a long account of the cruzada, which evidently struck him as a curious novelty. He says it is in reality a tax, for although nominally voluntary, the spiritual benefits are so great and the price so small that refusing to take it would indicate an indifference so nearly approaching to heterodoxy that every one buys it, especially as it comprises permission to evade all fasts.

[3] Relazioni, Serie I. T. V. p. 391. The real import of these sums can be

St. Peter's, the expenses of the organization, and the peculations inevitable in a business so complicated and employing so many hands, in a government notorious for profligacy of administration. In 1656 the pious Cardinal Moscoso y Sandoval, Archbishop of Toledo, did not hesitate to tell Philip IV. that of the revenues derived from ecclesiastical sources, including the cruzada, scarce a tenth part of what was paid actually reached the royal treasury.[1] These flourishing financial results show that the so-called reforms of St. Pius V. brought no alleviation to the population and no amelioration of methods. In 1584 Vincenzo Gradenigo writes that the cruzada is a heavy burden on these wretched people, for they are obliged to take the indulgence to enable them to confess and receive absolution; this costs two reales, and thus in a family of ten miserable persons they are forced to pay twenty reales, which can be earned only by hard labor for a long time.[2] We can readily believe the statement, for the business seemed to be one which rendered

computed by comparing them with the total revenue of Spain, which was recognized as the richest land in Europe, while the income of Philip was spoken of as the largest among monarchs, even without including Naples, Milan, and the Low Countries. From the reports of the Venetian envoys we have the following estimates of his Spanish revenues. In 1559, 5,000,000 ducats; in 1563, 4,600,000; in 1570, 4,500,000; in 1575, 5,500,000; in 1581, 6,500,000 (Relazioni, III. 363; V. 137, 169, 240, 294). Of this the portion derived from the Indies, arising from the royal fifth of the precious metals mined and the seignorage of ten per cent. on the coinage, amounted, in 1567, to 500,000 ducats; in 1570, to 600,000; in 1573, to 1,000,000; in 1581, to 1,000,000; then a sudden development of the mines occurred, and in 1595 it reached 3,000,000 (Ibid. V. 137, 169, 312, 464; VI. 457). Thus it will be seen that the proceeds of the cruzada were not far from those of the fabulous wealth of the Indies, which was popularly supposed to form the main source of Philip's revenues, and that, when the tribute to St. Peter's is added, they constituted a notable part of the amount drawn by the most crushing taxation from a population enriched by a monopoly of the commerce of the New World. Nearly the whole of the income of the cruzada was derived from the indulgences, for in the documents of the period the compositions and dispensations embraced in it occupy a comparatively insignificant position.

[1] Vicente de la Fuente, Historia Eclesiástica de España, T. III. p. 277. That Cardinal Moscoso had grounds for his assertion is visible in the fruitless efforts of Philip IV., in 1644 and 1647, to restrain the rapacity of his tax-collectors, who oppressed the people and enriched themselves.—Autos Acordados, Lib. III. Tit. ix. Auto 4 (Ed. 1775, pp. 367–73).

[2] Relazioni, Serie I. T. VI. p. 391.

those concerned in it oblivious to the moral law. In 1601 Philip III. repeated the recital of the frauds enumerated by Philip II. in 1554, showing that they had continued unchecked.[1]

Possibly Gradenigo may exaggerate somewhat when he says that taking the indulgence was indispensable for admission to confession and absolution, though doubtless a belief to this effect was inculcated. Neglect to purchase for several years, however, incurred suspicion of heresy, and is frequently alluded to as evidence in prosecutions by the Inquisition at this period. Any expression of disbelief in the virtue of the indulgence, moreover, was an offence effectively punished. In 1600 an Italian named Antonio Rubi, accused of saying that it was only a device for raising money, and that those who took it did worse things than the Lutherans, was sentenced to hear mass with a gag in his mouth and to ten years' exile. Still worse was the fate of Domingo Apollonio, a Genoese, in 1591, who, when urged to buy one, said that it was a cheat to rob people of two reales, for he was visited with one hundred lashes and five years in the galleys.[2] The Inquisition evidently was a useful adjunct to the treasury in this matter.

Successive popes, unmindful of the scandals inseparable from the business, regularly renewed the concessions of the cruzada every six years, the only interruption being from 1718 to 1720, when Clement XI. suspended it in consequence of Philip V., under the guidance of Cardinal Alberoni, attempting to recover the Italian possessions of Spain, and the suspension was speedily removed when Spain, humbled by disaster, acceded to the Quadruple Alliance by the treaty of London in 1720.[3] During this time its productiveness did not diminish. In 1612 Salazar says the income, clear of all expenses, is 200,000,000 maravedís, equivalent to 550,000 ducats;[4]

---

[1] Perez de Lara, p. 103.

[2] MSS. Königl. Universtäts Biblioth. Halle, Yc. 20 T. I. The Inquisition of Barcelona, in 1611, was more merciful with Jean Quedo, a young Frenchman, who, when questioned whether he had a *bula*, replied "What the devil have I to do with the *bula*; it is only a waste of money." This was qualified as heretical, but he was let off with abjuration and a pilgrimage to Monserrat. —Archivo General de Simancas; Consejo de la Inquisicion. Inquisicion de Barcelona, Libro 463, fol. 114.

[3] Bullar. T. VIII. pp. 203, 210, 213.

[4] Salazar, Inventaire Général des Royaumes d'Espagne, fol. 102*b* (Paris, 1612).

in 1658 the Venetian envoy estimates it at 800,000 pieces of eight, or about 580,000 ducats;[1] in 1756 the Augustinian, Manuel Santos Berrocosa, in his MS. *Ensayo del Teatro de Roma*, which cost him ten years' imprisonment by the Inquisition, declares that the Spanish nation spends yearly eleven million (presumably reales) in buying the graces of Christ;[2] towards the close of the eighteenth century Bourgoing says the annual product was between eighteen and twenty million reales.[3] At the same time excessive multiplication of the officials of the cruzada, who enjoyed exemption from certain onerous public duties and charges, was extremely burdensome to the people. In 1708 Philip V. endeavored to diminish the number to those absolutely necessary for the business. In 1743 he again attempted it, complaining bitterly of the abuse, and issuing rigorous orders for the suppression of the superfluous machinery and the abrogation of some of the obnoxious privileges. The cruzada, however, was too influential to submit, and in a few months the king was induced to restore the privileges.[4] Ferdinand VI., in 1750, was more successful when, by virtue of a decree of Benedict XIV., he made a radical change in the administration. He abolished the *Concejo de Cruzada;* the Commissioner-General was thereafter to be designated as "Apostolic Judge and Executor of the Briefs of his Holiness Benedict XIV.," with full authority over the ecclesiastical and spiritual affairs concerned, but the publication and preaching of the indulgence, the distribution of the bulls and the collection of the proceeds were entrusted to the Royal Superintendent of Finance and a board under his direction. The income was to be devoted to the maintenance of the African Presidios and to putting the southern coast in a condition of defence against corsairs.[5] There was in this, on the part of both king and pope, a frank acknowledgment that the indulgence was

[1] Zanctornato, Relatione di Spagna, p. 88 (Cosmopoli, 1672).

[2] MSS. Königl. Universitäts Biblioth. Halle, Yc. 20, T. XI.

[3] Tableau de l'Espagne Moderne, II. 21 (Paris, 1803). Bourgoing tells us that the price of the *bula* was 21 *cuartos* (virtually 2½ reales), equivalent to between 14 and 15 sous. This would imply an annual sale of about seven and a half million indulgences. The total revenue of Spain, in 1787, was 616,295,657 reales, so that the product of the cruzada was about three per cent. of the whole. In the French money of the period it was equivalent to about 5,700,000 francs.

[4] Autos Acordados, Lib. I. Tit. x. Auto 7; Lib. VI. Tit. xiv. Autos 2, 4.

[5] Novísima Recopilación, Leyes 11, 12, Tit. xi. Lib. II.

merely a financial resource. Apparently this was repugnant to the bigoted Carlos IV. who restored the old organization, in 1802, with the Commissioner-General at the head. At the same time the financial features were not neglected, for the new Commissioner was instructed to devise all possible means of increasing the productiveness of the business, and the most active measures were prescribed to enforce payments by purchasers on credit. It reveals a lack of a sense of humor that at the same time the Commissioner was directed to see that the dignity of so sacred an object was preserved in its full splendor.[1] The Napoleonic wars and the subsequent disturbances doubtless interfered with the cruzada,[2] but in the reaction which followed the troubles of 1822 and the invasion of the Duc d'Angoulême, Leo XII. revived the concession, and it has since been maintained, the renewals being made every twelve years. When Pius IX., in 1849, made his first grant, he omitted the clause authorizing the application of the indulgence to the dead, but the Commissioner-General, Cardinal Bonel y Orbe, Archbishop of Toledo, represented the matter to him, and he restored it in 1854, since when it has always been included.[3]

The Infidel has so long ceased to be a subject of terror that the fiction of a crusading indulgence has been wisely dropped and the proceeds of the cruzada are more decently converted to pious uses, though they still serve to relieve the burdens of the State and of the papacy. When Leo XII. renewed the concession he imposed the condition that a portion of the income should be paid to the Vatican and Lateran churches, to the Secretary of the Briefs and to the Nuncio at the Spanish court; this probably came to be neglected, for Pius IX., in the renewal of 1878, stipulated that the Commissioner-General should bind himself by a formal agreement to pay these sums.[4]

---

[1] Novís. Recop. Suplem. Leyes 1–5, Tit. xi. Lib. II.—"Para que . . . haga que se conserve en todo su esplendor la dignidad de un objeto tan sagrado."

[2] The revolt of the colonies seems to have suspended the cruzada. During the temporary reconquest of New Granada the old institutions were re-established. In 1816 the Inquisition was reorganized, and in 1819, in the effort to bring back the people to the feelings and memories of the past, the cruzada was published in a solemn procession.—Groot, Historia eclesíastica y civil de Nueva Granada, II. 475 (Bogotá, 1869–71).

[3] Salces, Explicación de la Bula de la Santa Cruzada, pp. 72, 73 (Madrid 1881).

[4] Pii PP. IX. Bull. *Dum Infidelium*, § xiii. (Salces, p. 393).

What is the percentage received by the pope is nowhere stated in the briefs, but the latest authority on indulgences informs us that it is large.[1] In the Concordat of 1851 it was provided that the revenue of the cruzada, after deducting the portion due to the Holy See, should be distributed by the bishops in pious uses in their respective dioceses, and in the supplementary convention of 1859 that it should be expended on divine service. In this convention the income was estimated at 3,000,000 pesetas, being the average of the previous five years, from which was to be deducted five per cent. for the administration in the dioceses and six per cent. for printing and general expenses, leaving 2,670,000 net revenue. The whole business is managed by the Commissioner-General and the bishops, but the proceeds are regarded as a part of the national budget, applicable to the subvention for divine worship—in fact, it was hoped that they would furnish all that was needed.[2] Saving corrupt or negligent administration, they presumably are thus applied, although Salces tells us that the majority of the faithful believe that they are misappropriated.[3]

As he further informs us, that, in 1874, and in some other years the receipts have fallen short of the estimated sum, it is a fair inference that they generally reach it and that it may be assumed as an

[1] Lépicier, Indulgences, their Origin, etc., p. 221 (London, 1895).

[2] Salces, pp. 328, 388. In a royal decree of October 30, 1873, it is declared "que los productos de cruzada han de ser destinados á suplir la dotacion destinada al culto divino, ó si es posible, á satisfacerla (Ib. p. 332).

A royal order of January 8, 1852, organized the cruzada thus. The Archbishop of Toledo is to furnish copy of the bulls by January 15th of each year, and is to have the proofs read. For his services he receives 16,000 reales a year. The management of the business is confided to a central *Direccion de Contabilidad*, which prints the bulls and delivers to each bishop what he calls for, the unsold ones to be returned within a month after the publication of the next year. Each bishop selects an administrator for his diocese, who gives security in government bonds to the amount of one-fourth of the sales of the previous year. Each bishop is allowed for expenses five per cent. of what he takes in, while the *Direccion central* sees to the payment to the pope. The suppression of all pensions on the fund suggests that a considerable portion had formerly been diverted in this way.—Sanchez, Expositio Bullæ sanctæ Cruciatæ, p. 9. This organization, I presume, substantially continues to the present time.

The Spanish peseta and centimo are nearly equivalent to the French franc and centime.

[3] Salces (p. 333) excuses himself for entering into the foregoing details "para sacar á la mayor parte de los fieles del error en que están de que á la limosna ó producto de las Bulas no se da el destino y aplicación tan santo."

average. This affords us a means of approximately computing the number of bulls annually sold. The present price of the *bula de difuntos* for all classes and of the *bula de vivos* for the common people is three reales, or, in the modern decimal currency, 75 céntimos, equivalent to about 15 cents of our money. For the *ilustres* the *bula de vivos* is 4.50 pesetas, or about 90 cents, the *ilustres* comprising the nobles, from royal princes down, the ecclesiastics from archbishops to cathedral canons, army officers from colonels upwards, officials down to judges; all the rest of the population is classed as *común*. For composition of unlawful gains the basis price is 1.15 pesetas, or 23 cents.[1] It may safely be assumed that the great mass of indulgences sold are the *común de vivos* and the *difuntos*, and that the other graces of the cruzada may be set against the papal portion of the income. The gross annual revenue being assumed at 3,000,000 pesetas, if we allow for the non-payment of a portion of those which are still, as of old, sold on credit, we shall probably not be far wrong if we estimate the annual consumption of the Spanish cruzada indulgence at about 3,500,000. As this doubtless includes the colonies, representing in all a population of about twenty millions, it shows that, in spite of the reduction in price, there is a marked falling off from the periods of more ardent faith, justifying Padre Salces in his regrets that the Spanish Catholics who avail themselves of the bull are few in number compared with those who undervalue it or regard it with indifference.[2]

---

[1] Salces, p. 39.

[2] Ibid. *Prólogo.*—"Tesoro del que se aprovechan los españoles católicos que son celosos de su salvación; pero que son pocos en comparación de los que hacen de él poco aprecio, mirándole con indiferencia."

In this phrase we may recognize the incurable habit of assuming that indulgences have power over the *culpa* as well as the *pœna*, and that they conduce to salvation, not merely to release from purgatory.

A fac-simile of the *común de vivos* will be found in the Appendix. It will be seen that it grants for the 75 céntimos not only a plenary in life and on the death-bed, but the Stations of Rome, including about ninety plenaries and ten liberations of souls. Also permission to eat milk-food and eggs on fast days, or, if the purchaser fasts, he gains for each day fifteen years and quarantines, and participation in all the good works of the Church. There is also provision for dispensations for "irregularities" of priests and for marriage within hidden degrees of spiritual affinity, to be settled for at prices determined in each case by the commissioner.

Besides this, those who take the bull and desire to eat meat on fast days can purchase a license at a cost ranging from 10 cents to $1.80, according to rank,

I have considered the Spanish cruzada thus in detail, because it not only illustrates the complete disregard of the Tridentine decrees, but also because it throws light on the methods and management of indulgences everywhere prior to the reforms of the counter-Reformation. These affected Spain less than any other land, and medieval beliefs and practices were continued there until modern times, affording us the documents revealing the inner workings of the system, which in the earlier ages we know only through the broad generalizations of popular complaints. Besides, the cruzada was by no means confined to Spain. Portugal has similarly enjoyed it under like conditions.[1] Sicily, as part of the Spanish dominions, likewise had the benefit of the crociata, administered by a sub-delegate of the Commissioner-General, and it continued after the island was lost to Spain, giving rise there, as elsewhere, to perpetual troubles between its officials and those of the royal courts.[2] In Naples, curiously enough, the people refused to admit it; it was impossible to persuade them that it was not connected with the Inquisition, their hatred of which was notorious, and they successfully resisted the introduction of both.[3] All this passed away in time, and, in 1778, Pius VI. granted to Ferdinand IV. of Naples a crociata, the proceeds of which, less a portion claimed by the pope for St. Peter's, was to be expended in strengthening the navy in order to repress the corsairs and bring back Christian captives; if any were used for

but Ash Wednesday, the Fridays in Lent, and the four last days of Holy Week are excepted.

[1] Nogueira, Expositio Bullæ Cruciatæ Lusitaniæ concessæ. Coloniæ, 1744. —Ceyro, Opusculum morale de Bulla Cruciata, Ulissiponæ, 1743. Father Ceyro informs us, in 1722, that in Portugal there were very few who did not avail themselves of the indulgence. As in Spain, there was a condition that a portion of the proceeds should be devoted to St. Peter's (Nogueira, Prolog. p. 7).

In 1823 Pius VII. renewed the cruzada for Portugal, but the indulgence could be gained only on certain specified days, amounting to forty-three in the year.—Pii PP. VII. Const. *Salus humani generis* (Bullar. Contin. VII. ii. 2317).

[2] Pirro, Italia Sacra T. II. p. 814.—Gervasii Siculæ Sanctiones (Panormi, 1751) T. II. pp. 363–5, 367–9, 371–81.

[3] A well-informed writer, in 1691, describing the Neapolitan abhorrence of the Inquisition, says: "No han querido admitir la Bula de la Santa Cruzada, suponiendo que depende de la Inquisicion de España, ni ha sido posible hacerlos capaces de que tiene otro origen su concession."—MSS. Königl. Universitäts Biblioth. Halle, Yc. 20, T. XVII.

other purposes it invalidated the concession. The *limosna* or price was fixed, for common folk, at 25 grani and 1 quattrino; for nobles, at 52½ grani, though extreme poverty excused the latter. It could be paid in instalments, or could be taken on credit, but the obligation was absolute, and had to be met. The indulgence was not the same as that of the Spanish cruzada; besides paying the fee, the applicant was to visit, on the days of the Stations of Rome, five churches, or five altars, or one altar five times, and pray for the intentions of the pope. For this he received all the indulgences enjoyed by the sodalities, confraternities and congregations existing in Naples, together with those of the Stations of Rome—an innumerable aggregation in all—the choice of a confessor once in life and at death, who could absolve for reserved cases, and in addition he was allowed the use of milk-food during fasts.[1] The concession ran for six years, and presumably has been renewed with more or less regularity, for the crociata is still enjoyed in Naples.[2]

Doubtless St. Pius V., in abrogating the clause as to lending helping hands, intended to put an end to all traffic in the spiritual treasure and all exchange of indulgences for money. To a great extent he succeeded, and the seventeenth century witnessed a marked improvement in these matters. Yet even Pius could yield his convictions when a sufficient temptation aroused his fiery spirit, and the continued abuses of the cruzada could plead some justification from his example. The league against the Turk, which ended in the triumph at Lepanto, was to him a veritable crusade. Monks and friars were distributed through the ships, and the crews were ordered to listen to them devoutly; beads were given to every man, and all were ordered to perform their devotions regularly; Don John of Austria was instructed to purify his forces, which was done by a three days' fast, with solemn processions; every one confessed and was absolved,

---

[1] Onofri, Spiegazione della Bolla della S. Crociata, Napoli, 1778, pp. iii.–iv. 32, 74–5, 97.—Onofri, Sermoni cinque, Napoli, 1783, pp. 85–6.

Onofri gives a list of the countries where the *crociata* was preached yearly, comprising Spain and its colonies, Portugal and its colonies, Sardinia, Genoa, Malta, Naples, and Sicily.

[2] Privitera, Manuale Antistitum, pp. 10, 18 (Neapoli, 1890).

The Neapolitan indulgence is much more costly than that of Spain, the price being about fifty francs.

took communion and received a plenary indulgence; blasphemy was forbidden under pain of death, and the hanging of two offenders just before the embarkation at Messina had a most salutary effect.[1] It is little wonder then that, intoxicated by the success of the expedition, Pius, in 1572, called all Europe to arms and endeavored to organize a general crusade, which should exterminate the Infidel. For this object he issued a bull of the true medieval flavor, patterned on those of the thirteenth century, with ample promises of indulgences. Not only those who should enlist or send substitutes, but all who should contribute congruously from their substance for so holy a purpose were to receive the fullest and amplest remission of all sins repented and confessed, such as former popes conceded to crusaders.[2] There was no distinction between this and the "helping hands," which he had prohibited, or the Spanish cruzada, which he had at first refused to renew; the sacrifice of principle was complete and was also gratuitous, for Europe failed to respond, and the project proved abortive. Whether any indulgences were sold for it does not appear, but if any collections were made they must have been trifling, for the death of Pius within two months doubtless put an end to the preaching of the crusade.

As thus even Pius admitted that there was no inherent objection to the payment of money for indulgences, the practice has continued in the Church up to the present time, although divested of the scandals which provoked the Lutheran revolt. It is true that "helping hands" have ceased to be invoked since the time when Pius denounced them, but the convenient and all-embracing term of "alms" has continued to be used, and so-called eleemosynary indulgences are still occasionally offered. This, as we have seen (p. 231), is a feature of all extraordinary jubilees; it appears in the earliest, issued by Pius V., in 1566, and has continued to the latest ones by Pius IX., in 1851 and 1869, and by Leo XIII., in 1879, 1881 and 1885.[3] Some-

[1] Catena, Vita di Pio V., pp. 210–11 (Roma, 1588).

[2] S. Pii PP. Const. *Cum Nos*, 12 Mart. 1572 (Bullar. II. 382).

[3] Pii PP. IX. Const. *Nemo certe ignorat* (Coll. Lacens. VII. 10).—Leon. PP. XIII. Litt. Apost. *Pontificis Maximi*; *Militans*; Litt. Encyc. *Extraordinarium* (Acta, I. 188; II. 204; VI. 119).

For that of 1869 Louis Veuillot opened, Feb. 25, a subscription in *l'Univers*, and by April 11 he had received 213,000 francs.—Chamard, Annales Ecclésiastiques, I. 86.

In the jubilee of 1851 Pius required, in addition to alms for the "poor," a

times the bull provides that the alms must be proportionate to the wealth of the penitent, sometimes that it is discretional with him or such as his devotion may prescribe, and commentators are not wholly agreed as to the practical import and construction of these phrases. The laxist, Busenbaum, informs us that the contribution may be trifling unless the bull prescribes that each must give according to his means, in which case the rich must pay more than the poor.[1] On the other hand, the rigorist, van Ranst, asserts that it must in all cases correspond to the means of the giver; for the very poor two *oboli* may suffice, but the wealthy must give something substantial, while a writer of the close of the eighteenth century argues that parsimony is out of place in acquiring so great a benefit; every one should give his superfluity and enough more to inflict some discomfort on himself, and in estimating the superfluity too much attention must not be bestowed on the future, for Christ commands us not to take thought for the morrow.[2] In 1886 Leo XIII. settled all doubts by prescribing that the alms must be in accordance with the advice of the confessor.[3]

The principle of exacting payment for indulgences is thus still fully admitted, and popes have continued to issue them conditioned on "alms," though of course with a reserve which, excepting the cruzada, excludes the scandals of the earlier period. A few instances will illustrate this. In a summary of concessions for the benefit of the Reformed Premonstratensians granted by Paul V., in 1606, is an indulgence of ten years to all who will assist in the reform with money or counsel.[4] Clement XI., in 1708, 1709 and 1715, granted plenaries for certain pious exercises including "almsgiving."[5] Benedict XIV., in 1743, had no scruple in risking a duplication of the scandals of the cruzada by granting to the Knights of Malta the right to sell indulgences at a price to be fixed by the officials of the Order,[6] nor

---

contribution to the work of the Propaganda Fidei.—Pii PP. IX. Encyc. *Ex aliis* (Acta, I. 349).

[1] Busenbaum, Medulla Theologiæ Moralis Lib. VI. Tract. ii. Art. 2, § 1, n. 14.—Liguori Theol. Moral. Lib. VI. n. 534.

[2] Van Ranst, Opusc. de Indulg. pp. 113–15.—Instruzione per un' Anima fedele, pp. 141–2 (Finale, 1787).

[3] Beringer, p. 447.

[4] Amort de Indulg. I. 138.

[5] These bulls are in a collection of papal documents in my possession.

[6] Bened. PP. XIV. Const. *Quoniam inter* (Bullar. Contin. I. 320).

The sale of this indulgence was conducted in the same manner as the Spanish

had, as we have just seen, Pius VI., in 1778, hesitation in making a similar concession to Ferdinand IV. of Naples. Pius VII., in 1806, aided the *Casa del Refugio* in Rome by promising a plenary to all contributors to it.[1] There is quite a medieval reminiscence in a grant by Gregory XVI., in 1835, of fifty days indulgence for every day's labor contributed to building an improved road to the Franciscan church of S. Maria de' Grazie near S. Severino, and about the same time he conceded a plenary to those who would join the *Adoratrici perpetue* and give a monthly alms in aid of the cult, specifying however that the expenditure of the moneys so received should be under the supervision of the Ordinary of the diocese.[2] In 1838 the question having arisen whether confraternities which, by consent of a bishop, pursued an organized system of begging, forfeited their indulgences, the Congregation of Indulgences decided in the negative, provided the funds thus collected were devoted to the fabric of the church or other pious uses, with consent of the Ordinary. Somewhat similar was a decision, in 1749, that when indulgences were announced from the pulpit collections might be made, but the people must be told that the oblations were not to be construed as payments for the indulgence.[3] Pius IX. went even further than his predecessors in his zeal for the *Association de la Propagation de la Foi*, for he granted twenty-seven plenaries per annum to all members paying the weekly dues, on the slender condition of a daily recital of a Pater and Ave and the invocation "St. Francis Xavier pray for us!" for here the money takes the place of more laborious spiritual exercises.[4] To another similar association, the

cruzada. There were bulls for the living, for the dead, and for eating eggs and milk-food during fasts. The prices were varied according to the station of the purchaser, and sales were made on credit. The commentator on the indulgence frankly states that the chief condition is the payment—"Ultima sed præcipua conditio . . . . est erogatio seu solutio eleemosynæ taxatæ a commissario."—Teuma, S. J. Decem Quæstiones Bullæ Cruciatæ, pp. 96, 98 (Melitæ, 1750).

[1] Raccolta, Ed. 1855, p. 374. This disappears in the edition of 1886.

[2] Decret. Authent. n. 483, 484.

[3] Decr. Authent. n. 184, 491. This is in accordance with the Tridentine decree, and follows the injunctions of S. Carlo Borromeo (Amort de Indulg. II. 49–50), who also gives instructions as to the location of the chest to receive the "alms," showing that contributions were expected.

[4] Decr. Authent. n. 639, 735. In 1850 he added that those absolutely too

Œuvre de la sainte Enfance, formed to secure small contributions from children for the missions in China, Pius granted a yearly plenary for the living and another for the dead,[1] and, in 1857, he offered to all who would contribute either money or work to the church missions, one hundred days every time they should recite three Aves, together with three plenaries per annum for praying for the papal intention.[2] The only distinction between this and the old crusading or St. Peter's indulgence is the increase of the reward and diminution of the work. St. Peter's is still a recognized justification for the sale of indulgences, for there are eleven days in the year on which a plenary can be obtained by visiting it and contributing to the fabric.[3] In view of all this, and of the share of the income of the cruzada, on which he insisted, it is not easy to acquit Pius of duplicity when, in his bull *Apostolicæ Sedis* of 1869, which replaced the old bulls *in Cœna Domini*, he included among the excommunications removable only by the pope that incurred by all who make profit out of indulgences or other spiritual graces.[4] This utterance is evidently to be taken in a parliamentary sense, for when, in 1884, the Archbishop of Bourges appealed for aid for his struggling seminary, Leo XIII. responded with a plenary promised to all who would join an association formed for its support.[5]

There has therefore been no change in the position of the Church as respects the "happy commerce" of exchanging its spiritual for temporal treasure, and it is only a question of discretion in avoiding the grosser scandals which provoked the emphatic protest of the sixteenth century. Modern theologians are still obliged, in disproving the charge of simony, to quote Aquinas and assert that spiritual graces are not exchanged for temporal things, but for temporal things ordained for spiritual ones; or, as Viva puts it, the act of

---

poor to make the regular payment may give what they can afford, and he exhorts the wealthier to increase their payments (Ibid. n. 645). The Ludwig-Missionsverein is the German section of this organization, where the weekly payment is one kronur and a half.—Maurel u. Schneider, Die Ablässe, ihr Wesen und ihr Gebrauch, p. 257 (Paderborn, 1874).

[1] Jouhanneaud, Dict. des Indulgences, p. 1243.

[2] Raccolta, Ed. 1855, Append. p. 457. Omitted in the edition of 1886.

[3] Mignanti, Indulgenze della Basilica Vaticana, pp. 135, 142, 143, 148 (Roma, 1864).

[4] Manuale Facult. minorum Pœnitentiar. p. 101 (Romæ, 1879).

[5] Leonis PP. XIII. Epist. *Gratissimum* (Acta, IV. 143).

giving for some pious purpose is itself a spiritual act and no more simony than the "alms" for a mass.[1] Bianchi cautions most strongly against conceding indulgences for gain, but if they are granted to fill the treasury of a secular or ecclesiastical prince, to enable him to perform some pious work for the utility, defence, or adornment of the Church, such as war with the Infidel or the erection of some church or hospital, or even for maintaining the fabric, then they are lawful, for this is not accumulation of money, but supplying the needs of the service of God and of the Church.[2] Palmieri is a little more cautious when he states that a proper and frequent object of indulgences is to reward the benefactors of the Church.[3]

It is evident that the council of Trent effected little reformation in the matter of indulgences, for the gradual disappearance of the grosser abuses is rather to be attributed to the competition with Protestantism, since, as we have seen, where that competition did not exist, as in Spain, the old abuses continued to flourish. On one point, however, we might have expected its decrees to be respected—when it exhorted to moderation in the granting of indulgences lest laxity should weaken ecclesiastical discipline. Yet in nothing were its commands treated with greater contempt than in this. The Holy See, it is true, ceased to scatter the treasure over Europe as an unfailing resource to replenish an exhausted treasury, but when indulgences ceased to be a regular financial expedient there was no longer an object in husbanding them for that purpose, and they have since then been bestowed with constantly increasing lavishness as a stimulus for the performance of the simplest spiritual exercises and for popularizing new fashions of devotion. Ample illustration of this will be found when we consider the modern uses to which they are put; the spirit in which the exhortations of the council were received at the time is sufficiently manifested by the grant, in 1565, by Pius IV. to the Confraternity of the Hospital of St. Lazarus, in which a plenary is promised to every one who in dying will bequeath it something, a plenary to a soul in purgatory for the payment of a sum to be fixed by the hospital, and in addition, as we have seen

[1] Van Ranst, Opusc. de Indulg. p. 195.—Viva de Jubilæo et Indulg. p. 56.
[2] Bianchi, Foriero dell' Anno Santo, p. 219, 287.
[3] Palmieri Tract. de Pœnitent. p. 450.

(p. 281) indulgences for the members of the confraternity bestowed with a reckless reduplication which shows how little store the donor set by them now that he could not use his control of the treasure for the temporal advantage of the Holy See.[1] Rodriguez, towards the close of the century, justifies the increasing facility of indulgences by the increasing sins of the faithful; formerly the popes, guided by the Holy Spirit, did not grant them so freely, but now, in view of our sins, they hasten to help the spiritual necessities of their children.[2] This pious confounding of cause and effect perhaps explains the progressive liberality in the dispensation of the treasure. In 1699 Bianchi assumes, as a rule, that every one can obtain from the pope whatever indulgences he may ask for. Priests can get them for the anniversaries of their chapels and oratories, and private persons for themselves. It is true that once, in 1676, when he was in presence of the pope, a religious asked for as many years of indulgence as he had spent hours in study, and the request was refused, but this was evidently an exceptional case, and people got them for the asking not only for themselves but for their friends. If a man, he says, obtains five hundred indulgences from the pope in an audience, it is well for him to get from the *Secretaria delle Indulgenze* a certificate of the fact, in order that he may be believed when he returns home; he can distribute them as he pleases, but he must not give them out in lots for others to distribute; still if a friend desires a dozen for his friends they can be attached to blessed medals or crosses, specifying the person for whom each is intended, and they can thus be conveyed through third hands.[3]

All this manifests a careless prodigality which is well illustrated in the progressive indulgences attached to the Angelus. John XXII. ordered church bells to be rung at twilight as a summons to the faithful to recite the Ave Maria, and to encourage this observance, in 1327, he offered an indulgence of ten days to those who would do so.[4] In 1449 Henry, Bishop of Constance, granted for three

[1] Pii PP. IV. Const. *Inter assiduas* (Bullar. II. 158).

[2] Rodriguez, Expositione della Bolla della S. Crociata, p. 23.

[3] Bianchi, Foriero dell' Anno Santo, pp. 282–3, 293. It was unlawful to pay anything for concessions, but it was advantageous to employ a *spedizzioniere* in procuring them—a professional of whom, as Bianchi tells us, there were many in Rome.

[4] Raynald. Annal. ann. 1327 n. 54.

Aves at the vesper bell forty days' remission of penance for mortal sins and a year for venials.[1] Adrian VI. has the credit of increasing to a plenary the indulgence offered by John XXII.,[2] but this is evidently an error, for Domingo Soto uses the possible grant of a plenary for an Ave or Pater as an argument *ad absurdum*, while Miguel Medina, in answering the accusation of the heretics that such indulgences were granted, shows that it was not an accepted and definite matter, and that those who granted it committed an abuse.[3] It was probably an assumption connected with the growth of the cult of the Virgin which sprang up with the increasing laxity of indulgences and without any definite sponsor. Finally, in 1724, Benedict XIII. authoritatively granted a hundred days for each recitation on the knees of the *Angelus Domini* with three Aves, at the sound of the morning, noon, or vesper bell, and a plenary every month for a single recitation per diem—an indulgence which has remained one of those excepted from suspension during jubilees.[4] It is no wonder that the Archbishop of Ravenna, in publishing Benedict's decree, pointed out that it is the indulgence most easy to gain, for it does not require fasting or pilgrimages or other things which the world regards as onerous, while at the same time one can gain every month a pardon like the jubilee, which remits the punishment due to our heaviest sins.[5] Yet even this facility, as we shall see, has become a common-place in more recent times.

The Tridentine decree confiding to bishops the supervision of indulgences in their respective dioceses has given rise to some fric-

[1] Pez, Thesaur. Anecd. VI. III. 259–61.

[2] Viva de Jubilæo et Indulg. p. 113.—Bianchi, Foriero, p. 216.

[3] Dom. Soto in IV. Sentt. Dist. XXI. Q. ii. Art. 3.—M. Medinæ Disput. de Indulgentiis Cap. XLVIII. "Nam plerumque ob unam salutationem angelicam ingens annorum numerus imo indulgentia plenaria tribuitur, et quod est ridiculum, una purgatorii anima ab ingentibus cruciatibus eximitur. Hic primum adversariis respondeo, hoc argumentum non indulgentiarum nullitatem sed dantium abusum probare."

[4] Decr. Authent. App. n. 13.—Raccolta, p. 195. The *Angelus* is "Angelus Domini nuntiavit Mariæ et concepit de Spiritu Sancta. Ecce ancilla Domini, fiat mihi secundum verbum tuum. Et Verbum caro factum est et habitavit in nobis."

For the variations in the formula of the Ave, see Macri Hierolexicon, s. v. *Salutatio Angelica*, and Addis & Arnold's Catholic Dictionary, p. 57.

[5] Collect. Bullar. *penes me.*

tion. That portion of it requiring them to investigate those current among their churches received obedience, at least in some places, though whether abuses were reported to provincial synods and referred for correction to Rome is doubtful, for I have nowhere found trace of such action. In 1576 S. Carlo Borromeo ordered a perquisition into the indulgences claimed by all churches in his province, when they were to be summarized and recorded in a book to be kept in the episcopal archives, and his example was followed by several French councils held in the following years.[1] The clause, however, requiring all new indulgences to be published by them was easily construed to render their confirmation necessary, and hence to give them not only supervisory but revisory power. Already, in 1565, S. Carlo Borromeo, in his instructions to priests, orders them not to publish indulgences without the assent of the bishop,[2] and when the council of Rouen, in 1581, warned bishops not to add or remove anything to or from indulgences which they publish we see that they were exercising the power of revising papal utterances.[3] The Gallican Church was especially prone to this subordination of papal to episcopal authority. When, in 1619, Paul V. granted to the doctors and bachelors of the Sorbonne certain indulgences for prayers, the faculty refused to take advantage of them until they should have been confirmed by the Bishop of Paris or his vicar.[4] This was certainly not contemplated by the fathers of Trent, yet the Gallican Church preserved it as a tradition even to the present century. The *Manuel de Limoges*, which had wide authority in France some fifty or sixty years since, states the received practice to be that no faculties or indulgences obtained in Rome are to be published without the written permission of the bishop.[5] Bishop Bouvier admits that an indulgence may be acquired and be valid without the episcopal *visa*, but it cannot be published, and he says that he had repeatedly refused to permit the exercise of faculties because the original rescript or a

[1] Amort de Indulg. II. 49.—C. Aquens. ann. 1585, De Indulg. (Harduin, X. 1570.)—C. Tolosan. ann. 1590, P. II. Cap. 12 (Ibid. p. 1806).—C. Avenionens. ann. 1594, Cap. 48 (Ibid. p. 1863).—C. Narbonens. ann. 1609, Cap. 48 (Ibid. p. 1863).

[2] C. Mediolanens. I. ann. 1565, P. I. Cap. 6 (Harduin. X. 642).

[3] C. Rotomagens. ann. 1581, De Episc. Offic. n. 36 (Harduin. X. 1234).

[4] D'Argentré Collect. Judic. de novis Error. II. II. 115.

[5] Jouhanneaud. Dict. des Indulg. p. 207.

properly authenticated copy had not been submitted to him, adding that when this is submitted it is his function to judge whether the publication is opportune.[1] The Holy See apparently grew restive under these episcopal pretensions. In 1839 it emphatically declared through the Congregation of Indulgences that when it granted a general indulgence to all the faithful they could gain it as soon as they ascertained that it had been granted, without awaiting the publication by the Ordinary. This was virtually overriding the Tridentine decree, and in 1842 the decision was reversed: the episcopal publication must be awaited. Two years later, in 1844, the question came up again, and after careful discussion the decision of 1839 was revived, rendering the episcopal intervention unnecessary; even local indulgences, such as those for churches, altars, and the like, are perfectly valid without publication by the Ordinary, though it is added that this should be awaited in order that the people may understand whether they are plenary or partial, and what are the conditions prescribed for their acquisition. Thus the episcopal concurrence is reduced as far as possible to a nullity, and this has remained the practice to the present day.[2]

Thus the counter-Reformation effected its object, but this has been due rather to pressure from without than to any acknowledgment from within of the intrinsic errors of the past. The "happy commerce" of the exchange of spiritual for temporal treasure still exists, but in most of the lands of the Roman obedience this is the exception rather than the rule. With the decline in the financial possibilities of the system, indulgences have greatly multiplied as an incentive to spiritual exercises, and they can thus be so easily obtained that there is no danger of the recurrence of the old abuses, even if the finer sense of fitness, characteristic of modern times, on the part of both prelates and people, did not deter the attempt. We shall consider hereafter the function of the indulgence in the changed order of things.

[1] Bouvier, Traité des Indulgences, pp. 56–8.

[2] Decr. Authent. n. 512, 551, 591.—Maurel u. Schneider, Die Ablässe, p. 96. —Beringer, Die Ablässe, pp. 95–6.

CHAPTER IX.

THE STATIONS OF ROME.

The frequent allusions made above to the Stations of Rome, as a measure of indulgences bestowed elsewhere, call for a few words on this feature of the system and on the indulgences enjoyed by the Roman churches.

The word station, as designating stated periods of prayer performed while standing in church, is as old as Tertullian, and it is related of Pope Hilary that, in the fifth century, he appointed certain officials to attend the established stations.[1] Under Gregory the Great it was the pope who celebrated mass on these occasions; his biographer informs us that he reorganized and regulated them, preaching twenty homilies at them, and then, falling sick, committed to others the recitation of the discourses which he composed.[2] We have seen (p. 133) how in the thirteenth century there arose a tradition that Gregory bestowed a seven years' indulgence for attendance on these services—a tradition which, as the sole evidence of the antiquity of indulgences in general and of those in the stations in particular, has been tenaciously adhered to up to the present time, in spite of its disproof by such scholars as Papenbroek, Pagi, and Amort.[3]

In considering the Jubilee (pp. 197–8) it has been seen how very

---

[1] "In urbe Roma constituit ministeriales qui circuirent constitutas stationes."—Anastas. Biblioth. Vit. S. Hilarii (Migne, CXXVIII. 350).

[2] Joh. Diac. Vit. Gregor. I. Lib. II. §§ 18, 41.

[3] Palmieri (Tract. de Pœnit. p. 453) admits that there is no evidence of this prior to the thirteenth century, but still asserts it on the authority of a bull of Boniface VIII. Even the official *Raccolta* (p. 465) does not hesitate to affirm it, and in this is obediently followed by Beringer (Die Ablässe, p. 385). Lavorio (Tract. de Jubilæo et Indulg. P. I. Cap. xvii. n. 43) tells us that in the time of the Apostles the indulgences for the stations were very few, but when, in 590 and 595, a terrible pestilence ravaged Italy, Gregory selected certain churches where on stated days divine service should be celebrated; to attract the people he granted indulgences of seven years and seven quarantines, and called them stations, a custom which has continued to the present time, when the number of indulgences has become infinite.

moderate in the thirteenth century were the indulgences bestowed on the Roman churches. This continued in the fourteenth. In 1321 John XXII. issued various briefs concerning the repairs of St. Peter's, which apparently was in a seriously dilapidated condition, and in 1322 he came to the rescue with the customary resource of an indulgence. In a bull addressed to the faithful everywhere he called upon them to aid in the pious undertaking, but the pardon which he offered was only of a year of enjoined penance for sins truly repented and confessed; the grant only ran for two years, and it became invalid if preached by quæstuarii. That this parsimony with the spiritual treasure was not due to any lack of interest in the matter is proved by his ordering at the same time certain revenues of his own in Rome to be sold and the proceeds applied to the repairs.[1]

There can be little doubt that the institution of the Jubilee led to an increased influx of pilgrims to Rome in all years, as well as to an enlarged expectation of indulgences to be gained there, resulting in a reckless competition between the Roman churches to secure a share in the attendant pecuniary advantages by meeting these expectations with corresponding attractions, while the absence of the papacy at Avignon relieved them to a considerable degree from supervision. Nothing else can well explain the sudden growth of the indulgences offered by them as enumerated in the "Stacions of Rome," compiled in England toward the end of the century (pp. 279 and 345), where we find plenaries and thousands of years promised by popes of all ages. It was a period of audacious forgery, as manifested in the Portiuncula and the Carmelite Scapular, and the prelates who conducted the Roman churches were not likely to be behind in the general scramble for a portion of the spiritual treasure. The former repute of Rome as a place of pilgrimage had been based on the number of saints and martyrs whose remains reposed there, but the inter-

[1] Bullar. Vatican. I. 262–4. John's directions for the handling of the money are suggestive of slender faith in the dignitaries of the basilica. A chest is to be placed in a convenient position in the church, in which the faithful are to deposit their offerings as God may inspire them; it is to have two iron locks with different keys, one to be kept by the papal vicar, Andrea Bishop of Terracina, the other by the chapter. It is to be opened once a month in the presence of five persons, whom he names, members of mercantile associations in Rome, to be divided between them and be paid out by them as required to John, canon of St. Peter's, and William, canon of Santa Cecilia.

cession of saints was a vague and unsatisfying benefit in comparison with the definite promise of an indulgence, and Rome now became known as a place where enormous indulgences were to be had by the faithful. In 1378 a witness in a case before a Roman court alludes to some Florentines who four years before had come thither "for the indulgences,"[1] and it was revealed to St. Birgitta that the indulgences of the Roman churches were of more weight with God than even what they promised, for those who come to them with proper disposition obtain not only remission of sins but will acquire eternal glory.[2] The English enumerations of the "Stations," referred to above, show how the fame of this went abroad, and the variations in the several recensions indicate how arbitrary and fluctuating were the attractions offered by the several churches, none of which could substantiate by documentary evidence the enormous pardons which it promised to the pilgrim. These lists also prove that the word "stations" was popularly used to signify the indulgences to be gained by the devotee at all times in all the churches, and not with its proper meaning of days of special observance in a limited number of churches. Already, however, in the fifteenth century the "Stations of Rome" came to be known as a standard, though no one probably could have defined with any precision of what they consisted. In 1464 we are told that Pius II. granted to the Benedictines of the Observance of Bursfeldt the indulgences of the Stations of Rome, which the chronicler characterizes as a huge and salvation-bearing gift.[3]

The Stations varied from time to time, some being dropped and others added. The learned Augustinian Onofrio Panvinio, about 1560, gives a list of them, showing forty-three churches, with eighty-six stations, celebrated on forty-three days, but they were by no means equally distributed, for St. Peter's had twenty, S. Maria Maggiore fifteen, S. John Lateran seven, S. Paolo six, S. Croce in Gerusalemma six and S. Lorenzo fuor le mura four.[4] The number

[1] Spicilegium Vaticanum, I. 49.

[2] S. Birgittæ Revelat. Lib. VI. Cap. 102.

[3] Pauli Langii Chron. Citizense ann. 1464 (Pistorii Rer. Germ. Scriptt. I. 1249).

[4] Onuph. Panvin. de Stationibus Urbis Romæ.—Ejusd. Le Sette Chiese principali di Roma, pp. 74, 283, 312 (Roma, 1570). He says the pope was accustomed to celebrate in those of the Lateran and S. Maria Maggiore (Ibid. pp. 182, 313).

of indulgences obtainable at these solemnities, as Lavorio says, was infinite. In fact they were so numerous and so various that few could understand them thoroughly. Rodriguez, in his work on the Cruzada, in the graces of which they were included, expatiates on their benefits, but evidently has not been able to obtain a clear conception of them. He tells us that certain authorities say that in Rome there are three places (to which women are not admitted) where plenary remission of all sins can be obtained every day; eight others where a third part of sins is remitted, and in many other churches there are innumerable indulgences. Some, he adds, assert that in Rome every day forty thousand years and forty thousand quarantines can be gained, besides many others, and these are multiplied on saints' days and doubled during Lent. According to some authorities he who visits a church on a day when there is a station not only gains the indulgence of the station, but also all the indulgences of the seven principal churches of Rome, but when there is not a station he gains only the indulgence of that church. The Franciscans, however, in virtue of a concession of Sixtus IV. and his successors, can gain all the indulgences of all the churches of Rome by daily reciting a Pater and an Ave.[1] In this the stations and the ordinary indulgences of the Roman churches are confused in a manner to show that the subject had grown too vast and too intricate to be mastered by even a trained and learned theologian. It was a supply which perhaps stimulated a demand, for a contemporary tells us that the appetite of the Romans for indulgences was insatiable; nowhere else was there such wonderful devotion evinced in visiting the churches and performing the stations; it pervaded all classes, from the highest to the lowest, and was gratified even at the risk of life from the excessive crowds, and some of the rounds, including four or five churches, made a circuit of sixteen miles.[2] Such devotion apparently redounded more to the temporal benefit of the churches than to the spiritual elevation of the devotees, for Rome at the time enjoyed the special reputation for immorality, which it had long maintained and has continued to hold.[3]

[1] Rodriguez, Explicatione della Bolla della S. Crociata, pp. 93–5.

[2] Azpilcuetæ de Oratione Cap. xxii. n. 89. The great devotion of the Roman people is chronicled, in 1683, by the author of *Roma Santa*, p. 153 (Roma, 1683).

[3] Consil. de Emend. Eccles. (Le Plat, Mon. C. Trident. II. 604).—De Thou, Histoire Universelle, Liv. XXXIX.

The mass of indulgences that thus grew up around the Stations became so complicated and cumbrous, and the priests of the several churches were so in the habit of magnifying their special advantages, that, in 1676, the Congregation of Indulgences sought to solve the questions which arose by the curious expedient of ordering the priests when announcing them to characterize them as simply indulgences, without specifying whether they were plenary or partial, thus leaving the sinner wholly in the dark as to the amount of remission which he was gaining.[1] Finally, about 1740, Ferraris endeavored to make out an authoritative list. It enumerates eighty-seven days for stations, with two additional for the three masses on Christmas, making eighty-nine in all. The summary of the several indulgences offered at these stations in the course of a year amounts to forty-nine plenaries, 1,505,697 years and 684,671 quarantines, besides twelve thirds of sins and the liberation of fourteen souls. There is also one indefinite indulgence *multorum annorum.*[2] Yet this list apparently did not settle the matter. In 1778 Onofri, in explaining the crociata of Naples, which gained the Stations of Rome and numerous other indulgences, makes out a table of ninety-four stations per annum, which in many respects differs from that of Ferraris, and he is careful to explain that confession is unnecessary to gain them.[3]

It was quite time that this unwieldy mass should be reduced to order and brought within reasonable limits, for its extent and com-

---

[1] Decr. Authent. n. 9. In 1710 a list of the Stations amounts to 85 in the year and avoids mention of indulgences.—Gallonio, Nuova Guida Angelica perpetua Romana, pp. 79–96.—In 1702 Piazza enumerates 93, and only alludes to a few plenaries (Eorterologia overo le sacre Stazioni Romane, Roma, 1702).

[2] Ferraris Prompta Biblioth. s. v. *Indulgentia,* Art. 4. n. 17–19. In 1844 the Congregation of Indulgences refers to Ferraris and the *Raccolta* as authorities for any indulgences contained in them.

A few instances will illustrate the individual character of the stations—

On Rogation Tuesday in May at S. Maria Maggiore—6048 years, as many quarantines and remission of one-third of sins.

Thursday after Pentecost at S. Lorenzo fuor le mura—28,000 years, remission of one-third of sins and liberation of a soul.

Feast of St. John the Evangelist at S. Maria Maggiore—plenary, also 50,000 years and liberation of a soul.

Christmas. First mass at S. Maria ad Præsepe—plenary, also 28,000 years and as many quarantines. Second mass at S. Anastasia—plenary, also 280,000 years and as many quarantines. Third mass at S. Maria Maggiore—plenary.

[3] Onofri, Spiegazione della Bolla della S. Crociata, pp. 366–9; Sermoni, p. 123.

plexity enabled the priests of any of the churches to vary or increase their promises almost at will. Accordingly, in 1777, the Congregation of Indulgences took up the matter and reformed it unsparingly. The decree recites that the order of 1676 was little respected; the rectors of the stational churches interpreted their indulgences in various ways; printed lists current among the people were amazingly diverse, leading to quarrels, abuses and scandals; the whole subject has therefore been carefully considered, and, by the advice of the Congregation, Pius VI. revokes all other indulgences than those herein contained. Then follows a condensed list; there are plenary indulgences in the Lateran on Holy Thursday, in S. Maria Maggiore on Easter Sunday, in St. Peter's on Ascension, and in St. Peter's and S. Maria Maggiore on Christmas; all the rest are small—mostly ten years and ten quarantines, with a few of fifteen and thirty of each; all liberations of souls and thirds of sins are swept away.[1] This incisive and wholesome reform was lasting. In 1827 Leo XII. granted an increase during Lent of an indulgence of forty years and quarantines for certain additional devotions, and if these are repeated for three days a plenary to those penitent and confessed who pray in a church.[2] The list at present in force is in conformity with these prescriptions. It designates eighty-seven days, with two extra services on Christmas, making eighty-nine stations in all, enjoyed by sixty churches; most of these have but one, and in some cases several are grouped on the same day, while St. Peter's has fourteen, S. Maria Maggiore thirteen, the Lateran seven, and some others four or three or two. The conditions, besides visiting the church, are true repentance, confession, and communion.[3]

The capacity of the Roman clergy in fabricating indulgences was by no means confined to the Stations. The churches favored with stations were not content with them, but added innumerable others, and those not thus favored emulated their rivals, until the aggregate became almost incomputable. It is perfectly fair to assume that the great mass of these were fictitious, for, reckless as were the popes in the distribution of the treasure, it is not to be imagined that they deliberately squandered it in this fashion. Still they cannot be

[1] Decr. Authent. n. 374.
[2] Ibid. n. 459.
[3] Raccolta, pp. 465–474.

supposed to have been ignorant of what was publicly done under their eyes, and as Benedict XIV. argued, when he confirmed the Lateran indulgences, their tacit assent would render it rash to call in question the validity of the indulgences.[1] The question, indeed, was delicate when for some centuries the faithful had been suffered to gain and to rely upon them, and now to throw doubt upon their genuineness would have created a scandal of the most serious character. I am not aware that any detailed list of these pardons has ever been compiled, but Ferraris summarizes them as amounting to at least thirty-eight plenaries per diem, all applicable to the dead, and in addition to these extraordinary ones there were ordinary plenaries in the several months as follows:

January	63	July	52
February	41	August	145
March	55	September	58
April	24	October	3
May	44	November	59
June	22	December	103

or six hundred and sixty-nine in all. As for partials, they are described as incomputable, and Padre Antonio Natale enumerates about two hundred daily ones aggregating 3903 years and 176,000 quarantines, of which eleven have also remission of one-third of sins.[2]

In addition to all this there are the privileged altars, masses at which liberate souls from purgatory. How many there are of these in all it would be impossible to say. There are seven principal churches in Rome, each of which has seven privileged altars. These churches are St. Peter's, St. Paul's, St. Sebastian's, St. John Lateran, Santa Croce in Gerusalemme, S. Lorenzo fuor le mura, and Santa Maria Maggiore. Their selection is traditionally explained thus. The Lateran, as the cathedral of the Bishop of Rome, naturally ranked first, and when the popes instituted the four patriarchs to govern the East, they designated four churches for them, so that when any of them should come to Rome he might have a church for himself; to Constantinople was assigned St. Peter's, to Alexandria

[1] Bened. PP. XIV. Const. *Assiduæ solicitudines* § 7.—De Synodo Diœcesan. Lib. XIII. Cap. xviii. § 6.

[2] Ferraris Prompta Biblioth. s. v. *Indulgentia*, Art. v. n. 7.

St. Paul's, to Antioch Santa Maria Maggiore, and to Jerusalem San Lorenzo. These five patriarchal churches were held in high honor, but as, in visiting them, it was necessary to pass St. Sebastian, where are the martyrs of the cemetery of St. Callistus and the Catacombs, and Santa Croce, where a large piece of the true cross is venerated, it became customary to visit all seven, and to excite devotion the popes bestowed on them innumerable indulgences. For instance, at the Lateran there was a plenary every day from May 20th to August 1st, besides the perpetual plenary granted by St. Sylvester; at St. Peter's every day 6048 years and quarantines and remission of one-third of sins; for devoutly ascending the stairs of St. Peter, seven years for each step and infinite other indulgences; at Santa Maria Maggiore, daily, 6048 years and quarantines and one-third of sins; at S. Lorenzo, daily, 7048 years and quarantines and one third of sins, besides which visiting it every Wednesday for a year liberates a soul; at S. Sebastian, daily, 6048 years and quarantines and one-third of sins, while entering the cemetery of Callistus gains a plenary through the merits of the 74,000 martyrs and 46 popes buried there; at Santa Croce, daily, 6940 years and quarantines and one-third of sins, while there is a daily plenary in the chapel of St. Helena, which, however, women can enter but once a year.[1]

These were only a portion of the indulgences, disconnected with the Stations, enjoyed by these churches, and from this brief enumeration it is easy to understand the fabulous aggregate. Nor was this confined to Rome, for these churches assumed the right of "communicating," doubtless for a consideration, their privileges to other churches and confraternities, as well as to chapels, oratories, altars and other pious foundations on their own lands, thus disseminating them broad-cast. To correct this abuse, in 1610, Paul V. ordered that the rules and limitations prescribed by Clement VIII., in 1604, with regard to the communication of indulgences by the religious orders, should be applicable to the churches and should require papal confirmation; at the same time he ratified all those in existence.[2] In this the Lateran appears to have been the chief offender, and it continued to be so. Renewals of the old communications and re-

[1] Ricci, dei Giubilei universali, pp. 185–6.—Ferraris, Prompta Biblioth. s. v. *Indulgentia*, Art. VI. n. 24, 25.

[2] Pauli PP. V. Const. *Quæ salubriter* (Bullar. III. 292).

quests for new ones were customarily approved by the popes, although the concessions contained clauses contrary to Clement's rule, and the special indulgences enjoyed by the Lateran on account of its pre-eminence were freely communicated. Bishops, in the exercise of their Tridentine prerogative, would frequently refuse to admit them, leading to controversies and lawsuits which perplexed the Congregation of Indulgences so that, after unavailingly endeavoring, in 1748, to limit the abuse, it applied to Benedict XIV. for a remedy.[1] He gave patient hearing to the Lateran chapter, but it could prove no papal authority for the powers which it had assumed, and he suspended, until such proof could be adduced, all the indulgences which it had granted, and meanwhile allowed to the beneficiaries a plenary for visits paid to them on five designated feasts, also the indulgences of the Stations on the seven station days of the Lateran, together with one of seven years and quarantines, and another of four years and quarantines.[2]

I have failed to meet with any formal action reducing to reasonable limits the overgrown chaos of pardons of the Roman churches. In 1775 there is some intimation of it in an application by Carlo dei Lancei, Cardinal of St. Praxeda, reciting that at the entrance of his church two stone tablets announced a daily indulgence of 12,000 years and quarantines and remission of one-third of sins; he admitted that there was no evidence of their authenticity, and that since the various reforms of the Roman indulgences their validity was doubtful, and he therefore prayed that a plenary be substituted for them. Pius VI. thereupon decreed that on the removal of the tablets a plenary could be had on any day, but only once a year, by any Christian duly penitent, confessed and communed, who should visit the church and pray in the customary manner.[3] When, soon after this, the Stations were remodelled and reduced, there does not appear any record of similar action with regard to other spiritual

---

[1] Decr. Authent. n. 164, 169.

[2] Bened. PP. XIV. Const. *Assiduæ solicitudines*, 2 Jun. 1751 (Bullar. Bened. XIV. III. 164).

This custom of communicating the indulgences of Roman churches to churches, chapels, altars and confraternities elsewhere is still maintained, but the application must have the approbation of the bishop.—Beringer, Die Ablässe, p. 388.

[3] Decr. Authent. n. 362.

graces, and as late as 1803 a collection of indulgences still gives the old enumeration of those of the Roman churches.[1] There has since then been a revision, but, so far from being a reform, it would seem to have been inspired by the conviction that, as the attractions of the Stations had been diminished, it was necessary to make amends by increasing the other indulgences of the Roman churches. A recent authoritative publication on those of St. Peter's shows that the old pardons of thousands of years have been replaced by the more effective and liberal device of plenaries, and of these St. Peter's alone offers enough to reassure the most despairing penitent. In 1738 Clement XII. bestowed on it one for every day in the year, obtainable *toties quoties* and applicable to the dead. This would in itself seem to render anything further superfluous, but there is another daily plenary *toties quoties* for visiting the seven altars, and also one obtainable monthly by praying before the altar of Peter and Paul. Besides these are sixty-two plenaries on special days of the year, in some cases two a day for different devotions. With this huge aggregate of over eight hundred plenaries *per annum*, it is not easy to understand why there should also be partials, but of such there are fourteen on every day, and others, too numerous to particularize, for special days, none of them, however, being for more than fifty years and quarantines.[2] All these are in addition to the Stations, and presumably the other Roman churches are similarly favored to a greater or less extent, so that the reduction in the Stations has been more than compensated for by increased liberality at other times. There is also the exposition of the Venerable Sacrament, rendered perpetual by Clement VIII., in 1592, by dividing it among all the churches in terms of forty hours each, a visit to which with prayer was rewarded with a plenary by Paul V. in 1606, confirmed by Pius IX. in 1876.[3] When plenaries are thus to be had in profusion by a simple visit to a single church, the act of Pius IX., in 1866, granting one for a visit to all the seven churches[4] is only explicable

[1] Raccolta di varie Indulgenze, Camerino, 1803, p. 188.

[2] Mignanti, Indulgenze della Basilica Vaticana, pp. 131–155 (Roma, 1864). Even Mignanti at times cannot thread his way through the labyrinth. He speaks (p. 42) of the altar known as the papal, which is rich in indulgences, but he has not been able to discover what they are.

[3] Roma Santa, pp. 26–7 (Roma, 1683).—Raccolta, p. 86.

[4] Raccolta, pp. 474–6.

on the principle which seems to have governed the excessive reduplications in St. Peter's—that it is impossible to offer to the faithful too many indulgences or under too many forms and conditions. When we add to these the privileged altars it would seem that Rome can furnish few occupants of purgatory.

Of the various special objects of devotion in Rome to which indulgences are attached, it will suffice to allude to the *Scala Santa*—according to tradition, the staircase of the Prætorium of Pilate, trodden repeatedly by the feet of Christ, stained with his blood during the passion, and brought to Rome, in 326, by St. Helena. It is true that the learned Panvinio regarded it as merely the ancient staircase of the Patriarchia, or palace of the Lateran, alluded to by Anastasius in his life of Adrian I. (772–795),[1] in which he is followed by various other scholars.[2] It is true also that Lucas Henschenius discovered on it traces of a Latin inscription, which would seem improbable in a structure erected in Jerusalem.[3] Moreover it was not regarded with particular veneration by Leo X. and his cardinals when, during the Lateran council, they more than once used it as an ordinary staircase, though the diarist speaks of it as the *scala sancta*, which is commonly called of Pilate, and says that Leo always uncovered his head and prayed as he ascended, and that women went up it on their knees.[4] Reverence for it increased as time wore on, and, in the jubilee of 1575, Gregory XIII. set the example of a pope ascending it kneeling, which was followed by Clement VIII., Urban VIII. and Innocent X. during their respective jubilees. It was dirty and ruinous, however, when, in 1590, Sixtus V. had it removed from its old position to its present abiding-place in front of the chapel of S. Lorenzo, known as the *Sancta Sanctorum*, which no woman is ever allowed to enter. To preserve it from the profane tread of human feet in the transfer each of the twenty-eight stones was reverently taken out and carried on men's shoulders and rebuilt from above downward, so that the order of the steps was reversed. Con-

[1] Onof. Panvinio, Le Sette Chiese di Roma, p. 219.—Anastas. Biblioth. Vit. Hadriani I. (Migne CXXVIII. 1183).

[2] Soresinus, De Scala Sancta, p. XIII. (Romæ, 1672).

[3] Ibid. p. VIII. From the remarks of Piazza (Eorterologia overo Le Sacre Stazioni Romane, p. 395) in 1702 there were evidently still overwise sceptics.

[4] Paridis de Grassis Diarium, pp. 5, 10, 22 (Romæ, 1884).

venient stairs at the same time were built on either side for popular use.[1]

The indulgences of the Scala Santa are gained by ascending it on the knees and reciting a prayer on each step, meditating on the passion of Christ. Curiously enough, the amount of the pardon thus acquired was long a subject of dispute. In 1672 Soresino tells us that there were four opinions—one that for every step the indulgence was for three years and quarantines, another that it was seven years and quarantines, many held it to be nine years and quarantines, and the rest 3000 years and quarantines. To settle the question he produces a bull of Paschal II. dated August 5, 1100, reciting how Sergius II. had erected the stairs before the portal of the Lateran and Leo IV. (847–855) had granted an indulgence of three years for every step to those who would mount them in prayer; to increase the reverence for them he now adds six years for every step ascended on the knees.[2] This somewhat audacious forgery did not at once produce the uniformity desired. In 1702 Piazza tells us that the indulgence is 9000 years and quarantines for every step; that this was granted by Paschal II., and has never been altered.[3] On the other hand, in 1724, van Ranst asserts that the whole indulgence for the ascent on the knees is three years and quarantines and one-third of sins.[4] Evidently there never had been any definite indulgence conceded to the Scala Santa and the fabrication by the Lateran chapter of the bull of Paschal failed to command implicit credence. At last, in 1817, Pius VII. was prevailed upon by the chapter to confirm it, and thus give it authenticity, and at the same time he made the indulgence applicable to the dead.[5] Pius IX. went further, and as if to show that the authenticity of the Scala Santa had nothing to do with the indulgence, he extended it to those who mount on their knees the stairs built on either side of it, between Christmas and Epiphany, during the whole of Lent, and from November 1 to November 9.[6]

[1] Ricci, dei Giubilei, pp. 282–89.—In 1683 we are told that the crowd of devotees ascending the steps was greatest on Fridays (Roma Santa, p. 136).

[2] Soresinus, De Scala Sancta, p. LV.

[3] Eorterologia, p. 398.

[4] Van Ranst Opusc. de Indulg. p. 87.

[5] Decr. Authent. n. 406. It is perhaps worthy of note that the *Raccolta* of 1855 asserts (p. 66) that the original bull of Paschal is preserved in the archives of the Lateran, while the edition of 1886 (p. 120) discreetly omits this statement, though it bases the indulgence on the grants of Leo IV. and Paschal.

[6] Raccolta, p. 120.

There is perhaps some interest in comparing the spiritual graces of Rome with those of the Holy Land. The latter, as stated by Ferraris in the last century, offers, in the Church of the Holy Sepulchre the liberation of a soul *a culpa et a pœna;* besides this there are twenty-one places enjoying plenaries and sixty-one with partials. These latter are usually moderate, mostly seven years and quarantines, though the garden in which Christ appeared to Magdalen has one of six hundred years and quarantines and there are one or two of forty or fifty years.[1]

[1] Ferraris Prompta Bibl. s. v. *Indulgentia*, Art. v. n. 8.

Onofri (Spiegazione della Bolla della S. Crociata, p. 53) in expatiating on the superior advantages of the crociata and the facility of its acquirement, gives a curious list of the fees demanded of the pilgrims to the holy places amounting in all to 21 ducats, 76 carlini, and 16 grana, besides a loaf of sugar to the officials at the entrance of the Holy Sepulchre, and all this in addition to the fatigues, dangers, and expense of the journey.

CHAPTER X.

THE RELIGIOUS ORDERS.

We have seen (pp. 234 sqq.) the eagerness of the religious Orders to obtain indulgences for themselves and their churches, and the influence which this exercised in stimulating the increased dispensation of the spiritual treasure. The bitter rivalry existing between them rendered impartiality essential, and this was reached in a series of papal decrees from the time of Sixtus IV. to that of Benedict XIV., whereby all privileges granted to the members of one became the common property of all.[1] The mass grew so unwieldy that in the progress of the counter-Reformation it was felt that it required to be reduced and simplified. Clement VIII. appointed a commission of cardinals to frame a scheme for this purpose; he died in 1605, but his successor, Paul V., had been a member of the commission and carried the scheme into effect. In 1606 he issued a decree revoking all indulgences of every kind enjoyed by the members of both the monastic and mendicant Orders, and replaced them with a series more moderate in character. On condition of repentance, confession and communion plenaries were given to novices on entering and on making profession, to priests at their first mass and to all present at it, to those who should go into retreat for ten days (reduced to eight days by Alexander VII., in 1659), to those who participate for two hours in the forty hours' prayer ordered by their superiors, to all undertaking missions to the heathen or to heretics, when starting on the journey and again when reaching their destination, and to every one at death who, if unable to confess and take the sacrament, shall feel contrition and devoutly invoke the name of Jesus. The Stations of Rome were, moreover, granted to those in cloisters who should, with devotion, visit their churches and pray. Besides these were some partials which need not detain us here.[2]

This wholesale and wholesome reform was naturally most unac-

[1] Ferraris Prompta Bibliotheca s. v. *Indulgentia*, Art. v. n. 71–6.

[2] Pauli PP. V. Const. *Romanus Pontifex*, 1606 (Bullar. III. 229).

ceptable, and persevering efforts were made to elude or to neutralize it. One method peculiarly effective was the allegation of grants verbally conferred—*oraculo vivæ vocis*—which were difficult to disprove, as they did not depend on documentary evidence. To check this, in 1622, Gregory XV. annulled all such concessions made to religious Orders by his predecessors, except when granted at the request of kings or authenticated by the signature of a cardinal. In 1631 Urban VIII. withdrew even these exceptions, but, in 1635, he modified this in so far as concerned grants subscribed by officials duly empowered.[1] These measures gave rise to much discussion, but they held good.

In this or in other ways one Order after another claimed that it had been exempted from the reform. The Franciscans argued that a bull of Paul V., confirming the graces and privileges bestowed on them by Clement VIII., released them from its operation.[2] Viva insists that the indulgences of the Jesuits had been restored.[3] Bogliasco endeavors by a chain of tenuous reasoning to prove that Paul could not have abrogated the enormous grant of Leo X. to the Franciscans and their tertiaries, and in this he is followed by Ferraris, whose work is admitted to be authoritative.[4] This process went on until it was publicly asserted that the act of Paul had been annulled, and, in 1666, Alexander VII. was obliged to condemn the proposition that all the indulgences of the Orders revoked by Paul had been revalidated, and this is held to be still in force.[5] Since then, however, there has been a constant pressure on the Holy See for new concessions, which has been largely successful, and the indul-

---

[1] Ferraris Prompta Biblioth. s. v. *Oraculo vivæ Vocis* n. 7–9. A sample of this method is seen in a *vidimus* given by Cardinal Geronimo that he had seen a statement by Cardinal Octavian, dated Nov. 28, 1606, that Paul V. declared orally that in his revocation he had not intended to include the indulgences of the churches of the Congregation of the Virgin Mary of Foligno (Amort de Indulg. I. 137).

[2] Summa Diana s. v. *Regularium Indulgentiæ* n. 1. Clement VIII. in fact had confirmed all their indulgences and privileges in 1595 (Amort de Indulg. I. 155).

[3] Viva, Damnatæ Theses, p. 113.

[4] Bogliasco, Indulgenza di Portiuncula, pp. 127–8. — Ferraris Prompta Biblioth. s. v. *Indulgentia*, Art. v. n. 1–5.

[5] Alexandri PP. VII. Decr. 18 Mart. 1666, Prop. 37.—Beringer, Die Ablässe, p. 766.

gences of the Orders are perhaps as great now as before the reform of 1606. To attempt an enumeration or analysis of them all would be fruitless, and one or two examples will suffice. According to a decree of 1838 the members of the Congregation of Missions obtain a plenary on entering the novitiate and again on taking the vows, after which they can gain two every month on days of their own selection by praying for the intention of the pope; also whenever they perform spiritual exercises, but only one in the course of each exercise; if sent abroad, one on starting and another on return; moreover, every Catholic who confesses and takes communion while a mission is being held receives a plenary.[1] The Congregation of Missions is an active Order engaged in arduous labors, but the contemplative ones are equally favored. Thus the summary of indulgences for the nuns of the Order of the Visitation of Mary, approved in 1848, gives plenaries twice a month, also on four feasts and three other days designated by the Ordinary, on six others designated by the Superioress, on the anniversaries of the baptism, profession and investment of each nun, on the Portiuncula day and on the feast of the Holy Heart of Mary, making in all forty-two a year, besides others at the general communion on the death of each member and on the death-bed. Besides these there are the Stations of Rome, and the indulgences of the Scala Santa and the seven altars of St. Peter's. For those visiting the churches of the Order there are seventeen days in the year on which plenaries can be obtained.[2]

The Franciscan Tertiaries occupy a position intermediate between the laity and the regulars. In 1751 Benedict XIV. revised and restricted their indulgences, but notwithstanding this they continued to claim that Urban VIII. and Innocent XII. restored to them the enormous grant of Leo X., whereby, in common with the friars, by simply reciting at any time five Paters, Aves and Glorias for the intention of the pope and one each for the grantors of the indulgence, they obtain all the pardons of the churches of Rome, of Jerusalem, of Compostella and of the Portiuncula.[3] However this may be, Pius IX., in 1856, restored to all the various classes of Tertiaries, even to the seculars who live in their own houses, all the indulgences granted

[1] Decr. Authent. n. 501. [2] Decr. Authent. n. 624.

[3] Bened. PP. XIV. Const. *Ad Romanum Pontificem*, 15 Mart. 1751.—Raccolta di varie Indulgenze, pp. 187–8 (Camerino, 1803).

to the regular friars of the Franciscan Order.[1] This encouragement was carried still further by Leo XIII., who rightly regards these organized laymen as a militia of no little value to the Church in these troublous times. In 1882 he urged that effort be made to increase the membership as much as possible, and, in 1883, he congratulated himself on the response given to his appeal. At the same time he revised the regulations and privileges. The minimum age for admission is 14, with a year's probation. The only vows required are to keep the laws of God and to obey the Church; but monthly confession and communion are prescribed with attendance at monthly meetings and wearing a scapular or girdle, and to ensure the observance of these rules the members are kept under supervision by a Visitor, who must be a friar, appointed by the Franciscan superior. The indulgences, besides numerous partials, amount to thirty-eight plenaries in the year, in addition to those on admission and the death-bed. There is a plenary also for eight days' meditation, while the monthly recital of five Paters, Aves and Glorias acquires the Stations of Rome, the Portiuncula and the indulgences of Jerusalem and Compostella.[2] It is evident that the old privileges are in no danger of serious reduction, and it is noteworthy how the experience of the crusades is revived in organizing a soldiery devoted to the Holy See and paid out of the spiritual treasure.

While the religious Orders thus struggled for indulgences for their members they were quite as active in securing concessions to their churches. From a financial point of view this was far more important, for though the "helping hand" is no longer a condition, the voluntary oblations of the sinners who are attracted by liberal pardons are as welcome as they were in the middle ages. Whether these indulgences were included in the reform of Pius V. was a subject of debate, but in 1678 the Congregation of Indulgences decided authoritatively in the negative.[3] This could scarce have been otherwise, for it would have placed the churches of the Orders at a serious disadvantage in comparison with those of the secular clergy. They have

---

[1] Decr. Authent. n. 702, 703.

[2] Leonis PP. XIII. Encyc. *Auspicato*, 17 Sept. 1882; Const. *Misericors*, 30 Maii, 1883; Epist. *Egregium Studium*, 30 Maii, 1883 (Acta, III, 142, 229, 234).

[3] Decr. Authent. n. 13.

therefore continued to enjoy the privileges so lavishly bestowed on them.

An attempt to collect and enumerate these in detail would reward neither the patience of the investigator nor that of the reader. Their multitudinous complexity would teach no principles beyond what can be gathered from a summary of one or two which are accessible in their entirety. Thus, disregarding partial indulgences, the Jesuit churches enjoy twenty plenaries a year for those visiting them on specified days, and there are various other plenaries for religious exercises, such as praying in a Jesuit church for six successive Sundays in honor of St. Aloysius Gonzaga, or for ten Sundays or other days immediately preceding or following the feast of St. Francis Xavier, or for ten Sundays preceding that of St. Ignatius; there is a plenary for visiting a Jesuit church in which the Venerable Sacrament is exposed, on any one of certain days in Lent; there is a monthly plenary for mental prayer or meditating on the Passion for a quarter of an hour a day; another for five days of spiritual exercises under a Jesuit director; another for visiting a Jesuit church after a day spent in the exercise known as the preparation for death.[1] Unless additional favors have been conferred on the Jesuits since this summary was approved in 1838, their churches are at a disadvantage compared with those of the Servites. These latter, in addition to numerous partials, have twenty-seven plenaries per annum; in each church moreover there is a privileged altar of the Seven Dolors and seven altars enriched with the indulgences of the seven altars of St. Peter's. Then there is a plenary for accompanying the Virgin of Sorrows in the solemn procession, another for presence at the forty hours' exposition of the Sacrament, another for an hour of mental prayer on the sorrows of the Virgin; another at death for assenting to taking the Scapular of the Seven Dolors and being buried

[1] Decr. Authent. n. 500. Paul V., in 1616, granted a privilege, confirmed in 1634 by Urban VIII., by which taking communion in a Jesuit church was rewarded with a plenary on one Sunday in each month (Amort de Indulg. II. 286), but as this is not included in the above summary it has probably lapsed.

In 1743 Benedict XIV. granted to the Augustinian churches plenaries for those taking communion in them on six feasts of the year.—Decr. Authent. n. 126.

It will be seen how numerous are the plenaries obtainable in any large town where there are churches of several different Orders.

with it; another for half an hour's prayer in honor of the Virgin on the afternoon of Good Friday or morning of Easter Saturday, and another for visiting on certain days seven times the stations of the *Via Matris*, representing the sorrows of the Virgin.[1]

This *Via Matris* is apparently an attempt to rival the exceedingly successful *Via Crucis* of the Franciscans. Since 1312 the latter were the official guardians of the Holy Places, and among the most notable of these were the fourteen stations along the Via Dolorosa and in the church of the Holy Sepulchre, which marked the successive scenes of the Crucifixion. To pilgrims devoutly visiting these there were indulgences granted, some plenary and some partial, though the details are lost by the destruction of the documents through a fire in the church under Pius V. We are told that on the return of the Franciscans to Europe in the middle of the fifteenth century they took to representing the Via Crucis in their cloisters, but that no indulgences were granted to them until 1686.[2] This is not wholly correct; the idea of representing the various scenes in the awful drama of the Atonement was a favorite in the middle ages, as the Passion-plays attest. In 1507 the Dominicans at Berne, who desired to disprove the Immaculate Conception, caused their tool and victim, the tailor Letser, to go through the various stages of the Passion in a church arranged for the purpose.[3] In 1515 we hear of a Via Crucis on a great scale, erected by Maximilian I. at Toblach, where there were 2000 paces between the House of Pilate and the first station of Christ, then sixty paces to the next station, twenty to the next, and so on. Of smaller proportions were two constructed in chapels at Schwatz and Seveldt (Tyrol) by the piety of Maximilian's chancellor, Cyprian of Sarenthal and Dorothea his wife, and for all these three, in February and March, 1515, Leo X. granted indulgences conditioned on the recitation of certain prayers before them.[4] This form of devotion seems to have attracted little attention until the Observantine Franciscans, under a general power of communicating their indulgences, undertook to apply to it, for the benefit of their members and affiliated bodies, the indulgences of the Jerusalem Via

---

[1] Guglielmi, Recueil des Indulgences, pp. 245–6.

[2] Wetzer und Welte s. v. *Kreuzweg* (VII. 1130).

[3] De quatuor Hæresiarchis nuper combustis (Strassburg, 1509).

[4] Hergenröther, Regesta Leonis PP. X. n. 14237–8, 14627.

Dolorosa. This was vigorously opposed by the rival Mendicants, and it required three decisions, one by Innocent XI., in 1686, and two by Innocent XII., in 1695 and 1696, to establish their right, which was rendered much more valuable to them when, in 1726, Benedict XIII. extended the indulgences to all the faithful visiting the stations of the Via Crucis erected in their churches.[1] The novel devotion speedily became popular; apparently it was attended with disorders and gave rise to rivalries, and, in 1731, Clement XII. was obliged to regulate it. The churches of the Observantine and Reformed Franciscans (Recollects) were declared exclusively entitled to it; it was recommended that there should always be two sets of stations in a church, one for men and the other for women; when the visitation was made in procession the sexes were to be kept separate; at each station a priest read aloud the meditation corresponding to it, the devotees uttered a Pater and Ave and elicited an act of contrition, and then passed on to the next; when performed singly the penitent did the same, without the assistance of the priest. It was forbidden to publish any definite indulgences, and it was only allowed to announce that they were the same as those of the Stations of Calvary—a wise precaution, seeing that the amount was unknown.[2] As the popularity of the exercise increased efforts were made to infringe the Observantine monopoly, and their rights had to be again affirmed in 1735; but when, in 1736, the Capuchin branch of the Order in Switzerland begged to be admitted to the privilege on the ground that there were no Observantine establishments there, their prayer was granted, subject to the assent of the Observantines.[3] Then, in 1742, the Capuchins of Sardinia represented that, since 1616, they had been accustomed to have Viæ Crucis in their churches, frequented by the faithful in expectation of indulgences. They especially designated their house of Valverde, near Sassari, and asked that it be granted the same pardons as were elsewhere attached to the devotion; also a similar concession to all existing in other places and all that might subsequently be erected. To this the answer was affirmative as respects Valverde; other ex-

[1] Decr. Authent. Append. n. 10, 11.—Ferraris s. v. *Indulgentia* Art. v. n. 58–9.

[2] Decr. Authent. n. 65. The Congregation of Indulgences has been repeatedly but vainly supplicated to define what these indulgences are.—Beringer, Die Ablässe, p. 262.

[3] Decr. Authent. n. 74, 87.

isting ones would be considered individually, and the third request was refused. The Observantines resented this intrusion on their privileges and endeavored to suppress it; scandals arose and an appeal had to be made to the Holy See, in 1745, when the previous decision was confirmed. Subsequently the Capuchins obtained from the Observantines a concession for Germany, but they were disturbed in the enjoyment of it, quarrels ensued, and, in 1762, they were obliged to appeal to Rome, which affirmed their rights.[1] The devotion spread rapidly everywhere, giving rise to many debates and questions. In 1748 the Congregation of Indulgences was obliged to decide that for the erection of a Via Crucis the consent in writing of the local superior and of the Ordinary or parish priest must be had as well as the deputation of the superior for its exercise. In Portugal it became so popular that Viæ Crucis were erected in oratories and chapels so small that there were but a few feet between the first and last station, leading to a decree that there must be some space between each station. It was probably in consequence of the difficulty of preserving order among the crowds flocking to obtain the indulgences that S. Leonardo da Porto Maurizio devised the plan of every one remaining still while the priest went from station to station reciting the prayers, and this was authoritatively confirmed in 1758.[2]

In time the exclusive Franciscan privilege was broken down, owing probably in great measure to the troubles of the Revolution and the long exclusion of the religious Orders from France. The Via Crucis became the property of the Church at large, secular as well as regular, subject to the authority of the Congregation of Indulgences or of the Observantine General, who grants faculties to priests or bishops for their erection; this was formerly restricted to places where there are no Observantine houses, but, in 1871, Pius IX. removed this limitation.[3] The irresistible tendency to facilitate the acquisition of indulgences is shown not only in this, but in substituting easier exercises than those originally prescribed. In 1804

[1] Decr. Authent. n. 120, 137, 256.

[2] Ibid. n. 170, 208, 241. In 1837, however, it was decided that the devotee must not stand still, but must move from station to station as much as the crowd will permit.—Ib. n. 528. We have seen (Vol. II. p. 197) that Padre Salvatori considered that the Via Crucis was a penance so severe that no penitent could be expected to perform it.

[3] Decr. Authent. n. 515, 527, 692, 714.—Beringer, Die Ablässe, pp. 247–9.

Pius VII. conceded that those unable to visit the church, or in places where there was no Via Crucis, could obtain the same indulgences by meditation before fourteen engravings of the Passion in a book prepared by Pietro Bombelli. This was, of course, a valuable privilege for him, and, in 1830, his sons represented to Pius VIII. that the book was out of print and much sought after; they still possessed the copper-plates engraved by their father and desired to reprint it, whereupon the pope renewed the concession, but required each copy of the book to contain a decree issued by an appropriate Observantine official.[1] A still further relaxation was that obtained, in 1832, by Maria Ferdinanda, Dowager Grand Duchess of Tuscany, in favor of the Archbishops of Florence and Pisa, whereby they were empowered to bless crosses through which members of the Sodality of St. Joseph, by holding one in the hand, could obtain all the indulgences of the Via Crucis on repeating twenty Paters, Aves and Trisagia—one for each station, five for the wounds of Christ and one for the papal intention. This was an entering wedge, and Pius IX. extended the privilege to all the faithful who, through sickness, imprisonment or other impediment, are prevented from visiting a church, provided the cross held in the hand is blessed by the superior of a Franciscan house. Finally, in 1884, Leo XIII. decreed that it sufficed if one person in a company held such a cross, when the rest would acquire the indulgence. The cross, however, must belong to the individual, and can neither be sold, given away or lent.[2]

The Via Crucis has given rise to a crowd of questions which show on what apparently trivial conditions depends the validity of the pardons conferred by it. In the private exercise the cross may be of brass or of any other solid material; in the public solemnity there must be fourteen crosses, one for each station; it is to these that the indulgences are attached, and they must be of wood; if of iron backed with wood, and the wood is not visible to the devotees, they are invalid, but the wood may be gilt or silvered, provided it

[1] Decr. Authent. n. 558; Append. n. 18.

[2] Ibid. n. 471, 472; Append. n. 20.—Raccolta, pp. 112–13. Leo had already, in 1882, granted the indulgences of the Via Crucis to the members of a pilgrimage to Jerusalem who should perform the exercises before a portable cross on shipboard and during the journey.—Epist. *Qui præterito*, 7 Mart. 1882 (Acta III. 31; XII. 13).

does not lead the observer to think that it is metal; they must also be crosses simply and not crucifixes.[1] The nicety of these rules exposes the faithful to some risk, for it is customary to have pictures as well as crosses at the stations, and there arose an impression that it was the former that carried the indulgences. In 1838 the Archbishop of Cambrai reported that this was the case in his see, so that in many places the crosses were omitted, and he begged for a remedy to prevent scandal. The benignant answer was the validation of the indulgences heretofore obtained, and instructions to have crosses secretly blessed and erected in the best way he could to avoid suspicion;[2] but it does not appear what was the condition of the souls of the faithful who had died in the confidence of the invalid pardons obtained during the existence of the error.

Other religious Orders have special faculties for indulgences connected with certain observances and objects, as we have seen in the Carmelite scapular, and shall see in the Dominican rosary and many other matters more conveniently discussed hereafter. Meanwhile this exceedingly imperfect summary of the privileges conferred on the regular churches may serve to indicate the ease with which, from this source alone, the sinner can obtain plenary indulgences at short intervals. The number of the religious Orders and Congregations is large, and their churches are scattered everywhere throughout the Catholic world.

---

[1] Raccolta, p. 112.—Beringer, Die Ablässe, p. 251.

[2] Decr. Authent. n. 487, 492.

CHAPTER XI.

THE CONFRATERNITIES.

The influence of the priesthood on the people is so largely exercised through the instrumentality of the associations known as Sodalities or Confraternities, and the development of these organizations is stimulated in so great a degree by the lavish use of indulgences, that some account of them becomes necessary for the completeness of our subject.

The existence of such associations can be traced to the earliest times — in fact the little bodies of converts in the cities of the Roman Empire were themselves nothing else, like the Roman *collegia* and Greek *thiasi* and *erani*. As their numbers increased, organizations of the more zealous members formed themselves for the purpose of uniting in pious exercises and paying every month a trifling sum which the treasurer expended in relieving the necessities of the poor.[1] This was, nominally at least, the model on which societies of the kind continued to flourish, but it was difficult to restrain them within proper bounds, and throughout the middle ages they constituted a subject of frequent anxiety to the rulers of the Church. In 852 Archbishop Hincmar endeavors to limit the *geldoniæ* or *confratriæ* to their proper functions of uniting in exercises of religion and charity, helping to bury the dead and assisting the needy. He forbids for the future, under pain of degradation for clerics and excommunication for laymen, the excesses to which they commonly led, crapulous feasting, lust, quarrels entailing homicide or prolonged enmity, and inordinate expenses.[2]

As the Church assumed to control everything connected with religion, and as the purpose, ostensibly at least, of these associations was the performance of religious duties, it asserted its authority, as in the case of Hincmar, to supervise and control them. This formed

[1] Tertull. Apologet. adv. Gentes, Cap 39. Cf. De Spectaculis, Cap. 11.

[2] Hincmari Capit. Presbyteris data, Cap. 16 —Cf. Concil. Nannetens. incerti anni Cap. 15 (Harduin. VI. I. 460).

part of the episcopal function, and the bishop in his visitations was instructed to enquire in every parish how they were conducted.[1] If properly performed this was no light task, for Hincmar's complaint of their disorderly excesses finds an echo in all succeeding ages. It was probably with a view of keeping the individual members under supervision and seeing that they paid their dues that, about 1195, Eudes, Bishop of Paris, ordered every parish priest to make a list of all his parishioners who were members of the confraternity of the church of Paris and of how much each was bound to pay.[2] Thus early the parish priest was assumed to be the responsible head of all such organizations among his subjects. That the episcopal consent was considered necessary to the establishment of these associations would appear from the approbation bestowed, in 1175, by Thibaut, Bishop of Amiens, on the confraternity of St. Nicholas, formed by Berenger the dean and his fellow-priests with the object of feeding the poor; he confirms the donations made to them and authorizes them to beg in order to carry it on.[3]

Throughout the middle ages we hear comparatively little of the confraternities, and that little, like the utterances of Hincmar, is mostly to their discredit, although occasionally we meet with favorable references to some of them. There was one known as the confraternity of the Blessed Virgin, which, in 1195, in Paris held annual services on the day after Trinity Sunday,[4] and this may be the same as that to which, in 1258 in Pavia and in 1259 in Piacenza, Alexander IV. conceded a hundred days' remission of enjoined penance on condition of their obeying their statutes and attending monthly service in honor of the Virgin in the Dominican church; moreover, in 1260 and 1263, he granted to them the privilege of divine service and Christian burial during interdicts, the same as to the Dominicans.[5] There are other confraternities, as we shall see hereafter, which assume to have originated in the thirteenth century, but their claims to this antiquity are doubtful. Thus an *Archiconfraternità del Confalone*, which did good work in sheltering pilgrims in the jubilee of 1625,

---

[1] Reginon. de Eccles. Discipl. Lib. II. v. 86.

[2] Odonis Episc. Parisiens. Synod. Constitt. Cap. 53 (Harduin. VI. II. 1946).

[3] Gousset, Actes de la Prov. ecclés. de Reims, II. 311.

[4] Odonis Episc. Paris. Constitt. Cap. 59 (Harduin. VI. II. 1946).

[5] Ripoll Bullar. Ord. Prædic. I. 366, 392, 403, 439.—Campi, Dell' Hist. Eccles. di Piacenza, II. 406.

asserted itself to be the same as one founded in 1264 by St. Bonaventura under the name of *Raccomendati di Santa Maria.*[1] There was no general disposition to favor these associations, however, and probably the indulgence granted by Alexander IV. to that of the Blessed Virgin is one of the earliest on record, induced, no doubt, by Dominican influence and predicated on the expectation that the Preaching Friars would prevent the disorders commonly attendant on the meetings of the brotherhoods. The same favor was shown to the *Crocesegnati*, semi-religious associations formed in the Italian cities after the assassination of St. Peter Martyr to aid and protect the Inquisition.[2] Guillaume de Trie, Archbishop of Reims, however, in 1331, when confirming and licensing the Confraternity of St. Gibrien, and permitting them to summon with a bell through the streets of Reims their members to their funerals, grants them no indulgences.[3] Even in the fifteenth century, when the treasure of the Church was so recklessly squandered, there was still but little liberality shown to these associations. The church of Antwerp acquired the prepuce of Christ, and a confraternity was formed for its adoration. When, in 1427, the Archbishop of Besançon gave to its members forty days' indulgence for visiting it on two feasts of the year, and when, in 1428, the Bishop of Cambrai confirmed this and added eleven feast days, it was rather to aid the church than the confraternity, for the grant was conditioned on stretching forth a helping hand. In 1446 Eugenius IV. made a greater concession in favor of the brotherhood, but this was only a plenary at death, and to earn it the members had to fast on Fridays for a year, while it was declared void in case of their sinning in confidence of obtaining it.[4]

It was natural that the Church should not be disposed to encourage these associations, for they were, for the most part, a source only of scandal, and the effort throughout the middle ages was rather to suppress than to stimulate them. In 1229 the council of Toulouse forbade, under heavy pecuniary penalties, all confraternities bound by oaths; in 1234 that of Arles regards them rather as conspiracies and prohibits their organization except with consent of the bishop;

[1] Ricci, De' Giubilei Universali, pp. 253–4.

[2] Ripoll VIII. 113.—Bern. Comens. Lucerna Inquis. s. vv. *Crucesignati, Indulgentia.*

[3] Gousset, Actes, etc., II. 576.

[4] Amort de Indulg. I. 201, 228.

in 1238 that of Champigny repeats this command and describes them as covering impiety with a cloak of piety; in 1248 that of Valence states that they have all been dissolved by the papal legate, and threatens excommunication for those who do not abandon them within two months, all of which is confirmed and emphasized, in 1251, by the council of Arles. In 1255 the council of Bordeaux complains that they seek to abridge ecclesiastical liberty; it endeavors to reform them by placing them under the control of the priesthood; it prescribes their objects as the repairing, lighting and ornamentation of churches, furnishing books, the burial of the dead with suffrages, repair of roads and bridges, averting pestilence, caring for the sick, precautions against inundations, collecting alms to be expended under the direction of the priest and other pious uses; all other objects are forbidden, and statutes concerning them are to be erased from their books within a month under pain of excommunication. Apparently, in 1282, the council of Avignon considers them incapable of reformation, for it orders them all to be dissolved.[1] That in fact they were not always formed for purposes of which the Church approved is manifested by the denunciation, in the early years of the fourteenth century, of confraternities in which the members were bound to defend each other at the common expense when cited before ecclesiastical courts—a very reasonable object when we consider the exactions and oppression customary in those courts, but which was forbidden as impeding ecclesiastical jurisdiction.[2] Less intelligible was the opposition shown by the Church to the associations which sprang up about this period, known as Alexian Brothers, Cellites and Lollards, who devoted themselves to the care of the sick and insane and the burial of the dead; they were persecuted by the ecclesiastical authorities, but were generally protected by the secular magistrates, who recognized their usefulness.[3]

[1] C. Tolosan. ann. 1229, Cap. 38 (Harduin. VII. 182).—C. Arelatens. ann. 1234, Cap. 9 (Ibid. 237).—C. Campiniacens. ann 1238, Cap. 32 (Ib. p. 323).—C. Valentin. ann. 1248, Cap. 20 (Ib. p. 428).—C. Insulan. ann. 1251, Cap. 11 (Ib. p. 434).—C. Burdegalens. ann. 1255, Cap. 29, 30 (Ib. pp. 474–5).—C. Avenionens. ann. 1282, Cap. 8 (Ib. p. 882).

[2] Statut. Cameracens. ann. 1300–1310 (Hartzheim IV. 78).—Statuta Remensia (Gousset, II. 556).

[3] Mosheim de Beghardis, pp. 461, 469.—Martini Append. ad Mosheim, pp. 585–88.—Hartzheim Concil. IV. 624–5. In 1472, at the request of Charles the

The general complaint against the brotherhoods was that their assemblies, convened under the pretext of pious exercises, were in reality only occasions for feasting and debauchery. So general was this that even the secular authorities felt it necessary to exercise supervision over them. In 1319 Philippe le Long issued letters-patent authorizing the formation of a confraternity for the cult of the Virgin, but at the same time requiring that the Prévôt of Paris or his deputy should be present at all their meetings in order to prevent scandal.[1] The Church endeavored less effectually to control them by defining the rule that none should be formed without episcopal license, and that all unable to obtain this should be dissolved.[2] It was all in vain. At the council of Bâle the disorders of these bodies formed one of the complaints of the Hussites, and Gilles Charlier in reply admitted that under the guise of piety they gave rise to many evils—illicit gain, inordinate favors, audacity in sinning and the like—but he argued that they were not in themselves unlawful, they had at least a claim of honest purpose and were capable of good.[3] This capacity, however, was not developed, for even the priests could not be trusted. In 1481 the council of Tournay forbids all parish priests from permitting the organization of new confraternities without the episcopal assent, or allowing them to hold their feasts in the churches, or to cook their food in the cemeteries, under a fine of twenty livres.[4] These banquets, which evidently were the chief attraction of the associations, raised the question whether the entrance fees and monthly payments were simoniacal or not, and on this the doctors were divided, but Angiolo da Chivasso decides that if the money is spent in pious uses, such as aiding the poor, there is no simony.[5] Occasionally, moreover, they were put to a more practical use as an agency for selling indulgences, as in a concession by Leo X., in 1515, to Richard, Archbishop of Trèves, whose roads and bridges were in such bad repair as to inter-

Bold, Sixtus IV. received the Alexian brothers into the recognized religious Orders, and, in 1506, Julius II. granted them special privileges.

[1] Preuves des Libertez de l'Église Gallicane, II. 144.

[2] Bochelli Decr. Eccles. Gallican. Lib. VI. Tit. 10, Cap. 1, 23.—C. Suessionens. ann. 1403, Cap. 96 (Gousset, II. 636).

[3] Ægid. Carlerii Orat. (Canisius et Basnage, IV. 603).

[4] C. Tornacens. ann. 1481, Cap. 6 (Gousset, II. 758).

[5] Summa Angelica s. v. *Confraternitas*, § 1.

fere with pilgrimage and trade, wherefore he was authorized to erect a confraternity under the name of St. Peter, which for twenty years should beg alms for that purpose and confer indulgences on contributors.[1] Indulgences, however, for the members themselves of these fraternities had hitherto been very sparingly bestowed. It was about this time, as we shall presently see, that the confraternities of the Rosary were stimulated by the offer of pardons, but a tract on the subject, in 1500, makes no allusion to advantages of the kind to be gained by membership. The writer confines himself wholly to the spiritual benefit, to the living and dead, to be derived from participation in the pious works of the brotherhoods, and he deprecated all money payments save for the celebration of masses and solemnization of funeral services.[2] Yet this reticence wore off as the sixteenth century advanced and the confraternities were recognized as convenient instruments for raising money by granting indulgences in return for the entrance-fee or for contributions. The cumulative episcopal indulgence organized by Philip II. in 1569 (pp. 176, 423) was arranged under cover of a confraternity, and we have seen (pp. 281, 442) the enormous grants of Pius IV. to the confraternity of the Hospital of St. Lazarus.

In spite of the perpetual endeavor to limit and regulate these associations they offered too many attractions for license under a pretext of pious observance, not to flourish and multiply in a coarse and superstitious age, which found in them the opportunity to gratify at the same time its sensual and spiritual appetites. At the jubilee of 1500, which was reckoned a failure, no less than 570 confraternities came to Rome in organized companies,[3] but as time wore on their morals and their influence did not improve. In the project of reform laid by the Cardinal-legate Campeggio before the diet of Ratisbon, in 1524, he proposed that the banquets of priests, at funerals and in confraternities, held publicly in taverns, should be suppressed, as they are a scandal to the laity.[4] Two years later the synod of Chartres deplores that bodies originally intended for good should be given to so much that is wholly adverse to religion, and it forbids in their meetings the dissolute feasting and drinking and

[1] Hergenröther, Regest. Leon. X. n. 13671.

[2] Tractatus de Fraternitatibus in generali (Memmingen, 1500).

[3] Ricci, De' Giubilei universali, p. 121.

[4] Constit. Ratisponens. Cap. 8 (Hartzheim, VI. 200).

dancing, rather befitting Bacchanalian rites than Christian observances.[1] In 1528 the council of Sens repeated this denunciation; it attributed the evil to the excessive multiplication of these bodies, and ordered no new ones to be formed without episcopal approbation, while all those in existence were to bring their statutes and statements of accounts to the bishops, to be acted on as the latter should see fit, while in future no money should be spent in feasting.[2] The scandal must have been great to render this a serious question between the Church and the reformers, but that it was so is manifested not only by Campeggio's proposition, but by Erasmus when, in 1533, he put forward a scheme of compromise on which the heretics and orthodox might reunite. In this he proposed that the secular power should suppress not only the feasts of the brotherhoods, but the brotherhoods themselves, for they are nothing but conventicles of Comus and Bacchus.[3] The secular power, in fact, soon afterwards interfered. Possibly there may have been some political motive at work when, in 1546, Charles V. suppressed the confraternity of St. Lievind, with its pilgrimages and processions, in his turbulent city of Ghent, but such does not appear to have been the case when Henry II., some ten years later, disbanded all those of Dauphiné and the Marquisate of Saluces, for wasting their money, and ordered their funds to be applied to hospitals and to the poor.[4] In 1563 Charles IX. endeavored to suppress the more reprehensible features of these associations by imposing a fine of five hundred *livres tournois* on all who took part in their riotous feastings, one-third of the fine to go to the informer, one-third to the poor and one-third to the crown, but it was probably impossible to enforce this, for, in 1566, he issued another edict enjoining the observance of the previous one.[5] In the troublous times of the League there was probably sufficient

[1] Synod. Carnotens. 1526 (Bochelli, Lib. VI. Tit. 10, Cap. 7).

[2] C. Senonens. ann. 1528, Decreta Morum, 30 (Harduin. IX. 1960).

[3] Erasmus de Ecclesiæ Concordia (Lug. Bat. 1641, pp. 147–8).

[4] Preuves des Libertez de l'Église Gallicane, II. 148, 152.

[5] Isambert, Anc. Loix Françaises, XV. 169, 210. In the latter of these there is an allusion to *bastons* as one of the features of these celebrations, which is explained by a clause in a decree of the council of Paris, in 1557, endeavoring to reform these bodies. It specially reprehends the carrying of staves with images to the houses of laymen by a disorderly crowd of priests, women and actors, which it prohibits under arbitrary penalties.—C. Parisiens. ann. 1557 (Bochelli Decr. Eccles. Gallican. Lib. VI. Tit. 10, Cap. 4).

reason of state for the action of the Parlement of Bordeaux, in 1590, on learning that Jean d'Arnis, Guardian of the Observantine Franciscans, was organizing a confraternity of the *Cordigeri* (founded by Sixtus V., in 1585), when it sternly prohibited all concerned from proceeding further under pain of death. In 1595 doubtless it was a similar motive that impelled Henry IV. to write to the Parlement of Paris from Amiens that the Dominicans had recently founded a confraternity, meeting on the first day of each month, who had hung up a most scandalous picture; whereupon the Parlement, on investigation, pronounced the picture very scandalous and the association designed to abuse popular credulity under the veil of religion; it ordered the brotherhood to be dissolved and all concerned to be prosecuted. Similarly, in 1596, a confraternity of the *Cordigeri* was suppressed, lest it should disturb the public tranquillity, as had happened elsewhere, and as late as 1601 the Parlement disbanded another confraternity of St. Jerome at Bourges.[1]

Meanwhile the council of Trent, in 1562, had not seen fit to raise its voice against these disorders, but had merely, in enumerating the powers of bishops, authorized them to visit all hospitals, colleges and confraternities of laymen.[2] This was conferring no new functions, but only recognizing the responsibility which the Church had always had for these associations formed under its auspices. Possibly it may have encouraged the bishops, however, for in the councils held in France, during the remainder of the century, to carry out the counter-Reformation, there appears to have been vigorous and concerted action to repress the abuses, which are described as flourishing as rankly as ever.[3]

At length, in 1604, Clement VIII. undertook the long-needed reform. Complaining that certain evil customs had caused many unfitting results, he issued an elaborate decree to bring all confraternities into a general system and subject them to the approbation and supervision of the bishops. The indulgences with which they were mostly endowed by this time were sources of gain, largely ex-

[1] Preuves des Libertez de l'Église Gallicane, II. 149, 150, 151.

[2] C. Trident. Sess. XXII. De Reform. Cap. 8.

[3] C. Ebroicens. ann. 1576 (Bochelli Lib. VI. Tit. 10, Cap. 22).—C. Bituricens. ann. 1584, Tit. XLIV. Cap. 1 (Harduin. X. 1504).—C. Tolosan. ann. 1590. P. III. Cap. 7 (Ibid. p. 1814).—C. Avenionens. ann. 1594, Cap. 52 (Ibid. p. 1866).—C. Narbonnens. ann. 1609, Cap. 27, 34 (Ib. XI. 29, 39).

pended, as we have seen, in coarse debauchery. To cure this he ordered all the chests, tables and basins to be removed from the churches and all collections to be devoted to repairs and other pious uses. The freedom of choosing confessors was limited to those having episcopal licenses, and all confraternities and congregations were required to obtain confirmation of their privileges within a year, if in Europe, or within two years if abroad, in default of which all their indulgences and graces were declared to be revoked and annulled.[1] In 1608 a further abuse was aimed at, by which the officials of the Archconfraternities in Rome charged excessive fees for letters of affiliation to associations formed elsewhere; for the future the charge was fixed at one gold crown for all expenses and fees; nothing more was to be accepted, even as alms or gratuities, under pain of nullity of the letters, forfeiture of the indulgences contained in them, deprivation of office and inability of reappointment. The abuse was inveterate however, and the decree had to be repeated several times, up to 1756.[2] From this wholesome legislation we learn the main source of the funds, of which the misappropriation had been so vigorously denounced by the local authorities. An Archconfraternity would be formed in Rome and would secure from the curia or from some religious Order certain graces or indulgences.[3] Subordinate confraternities would be organized wherever possible, to which letters of aggregation would be issued communicating the indulgences, and the sale of these letters would supply the treasury of the central body, while the affiliated associations would make their profit from the "alms" contributed by the faithful.[4] To a large extent the decrees of Clement VIII. and Paul V. broke up this business, and we enter upon a new phase in the development of the con-

[1] Clement. PP. VIII. Const. *Quæcumque*, 7 Dec. 1604 (Bullar. III. 182).

[2] Decr. Authent. n. 42, 45, 230, 232.

[3] In 1671 the Congregation of Indulgences forbade the religious Orders from communicating to confraternities the indulgences which they enjoy, and, in 1678, it pronounced invalid all which had thus been communicated prior to the decrees of Clement and Paul.—Decr. Authent. n. 5, 14.

[4] Systematic begging was also a resource of the confraternities. In 1564 Pierre de Bonneville, on trial for Lutheranism before the Inquisition of Toledo, admitted that he had refused a *limosna* to Guillermo Mario, who, with an image of the Virgin, was begging for a confraternity, and he gave as his reason that the alms thus contributed were generally misapplied.—MSS. Königl. Bibl. Univ. Halle, Yc. 20, T. V.

fraternities. As they ceased to be organizations for peddling out indulgences and were brought more strictly under episcopal control their utility as a means of influencing the populations became more clearly recognized; they were placed under the leadership of the parish priests, their development was stimulated by the lavish bestowal on their members of indulgences, which were no longer a matter of bargain and sale, and they gradually became, what we see them now, one of the most efficient instrumentalities for bringing the domination of the Church to bear upon the individual.

This process was necessarily slow, and the habit of regarding these associations as designed rather for convivial than for spiritual purposes was hard to eradicate. In the latter half of the seventeenth century Macro quotes without protest Guillaume Budé's definition of them as brotherhoods of feasters who assemble for the gratification of their appetites rather than for worship.[1] About 1750 Serrada speaks as though all the old abuses were still frequent in Spain, and he asks whether banquets accompanied with gluttony and drunkenness render honor to saints who earned their canonization by mortifications of the flesh.[2] Among his various reforms Carlos III. took this up, and, in 1783, suppressed all confraternities that could not show both royal and ecclesiastical confirmation, while in those allowed to exist the abuses and superfluous expenses were to be rigidly corrected, and a new series of regulations was to be framed and submitted to the king for confirmation.[3] In the same year Leopold of Tuscany dissolved those in his dominions, giving as a reason the great evils arising from the parish churches being almost deserted for the oratories of these bodies. He only allowed one to survive—the *Compagnia della Misericordia*, which was directed to devote itself to acts of Christian charity. The property of the rest was ordered to be returned to those who could prove claim to it, and what was not so distributed was to be devoted to the service of religion.[4] Leopold's complaint as to the monopolizing tendency of the confraternities was doubtless well grounded, for under the stimu-

[1] Macri Hierolexicon s. v. *Confratria* (Venetiis, 1712). Budé, in speaking of them as *coepulones*, probably intended a classical allusion to the *septemviri epulonum*—the college of priests who superintended the sacrificial banquets.

[2] Serrada, Escudo del Carmelo, p. 308.

[3] Novísima Recopilación, Ley 6, Tit. ii. Lib. I.

[4] Atti e Decreti del Consiglio di Pistoja, Append. XIV.

lus of excessive indulgences granted to them they were multiplying everywhere. A contemporary polemic on the other side boasts that virtually every Catholic was a member of one of them, and the number swept away by Leopold's decree is estimated at 2500.[1] Even in the present century, as late as 1815, in Sicily the confraternities are described by Padre Pusateri as having abandoned all good works and assembling only for processions, which they make use of for display and dissipation, with excesses of eating and drinking, and causing great scandal by their quarrels over questions of etiquette and precedence.[2] It was doubtless, however, political rather than moral reasons that led the Italian government, in 1891, to suppress the confraternities in Rome, a measure which, with some other sup-

[1] Istruzione per un' Anima fedele, p. 147.—Cantù, Eretici d'Italia, III. 472.

Archbishop Beaumont of Paris had recently started a devotion in which three persons should combine, and three times a day, in honor of the Trinity, recite, either together or separately, seven Glorias and one Ave. Pius VI. favored it, and by decree of the Congregation of Indulgences, May 15, 1784, granted a hundred days' indulgence for each day on which it was performed, seven years and seven quarantines for each Sunday, and also two plenaries a month on Sundays on which, after repentance, confession and communion, they should pray for the intention of the pope (Decr. Authent. n. 389). Letters announcing this were scattered through Italy, and Leopold promptly prohibited their circulation. Bishop Ricci followed this up with a circular to his Vicari Foranei, in which he said "It seeks to make simple people believe that the Roman Pontiff has enriched with extravagant spiritual graces a pretended company of three persons uniting themselves in honor of the Holy Trinity. The indiscreet profusion of indulgences, the superstitious adoption of the number three, the firm faith which it asserts that certain minute practices of piety are a passport to heaven, are sufficient to convince any man of sense that the author of this decree is a forger, though he has dared to append to it the respectable names of the Vice-Prefect and Secretary of the Congregation of Indulgences." Ricci therefore orders the vicars to explain to the people the true doctrine of indulgences and to warn them of this device of the enemy to sow tares in the field confided to their care by God.—Atti e Decreti del Consiglio di Pistoja, Append. XXXIV.

[2] Pusateri, Riforma del Clero e del Monachismo di Sicilia, p. 191 (Palermo, 1815). This matter of precedence has long been the source of heart-burning. In preparation for the jubilee of 1700 the cardinals in charge, in their instruction to bishops, warn them against allowing the confraternities to struggle for precedence, as it had been decreed that on the present occasion no prejudice should ensue to their rights nor any precedent be established. Those who incite such strife are to be subjected to severe corporal punishment.—Amort de Indulg. I. 121.

pressions, as the journals of the day informed us, reduced the number of masses celebrated on Sundays from 5300 to 800.

This, however, did not affect the standing of these bodies elsewhere, and their growth is unceasing. In 1861 Pius IX. stimulated it by a decree facilitating their organization and removing various doubts which hung around them. In the case of many of them their legality was questionable, but he cured all irregularities and validated them all. In spite of the rules of the Congregations of the Index and of Indulgences he authorized them to print their summaries of indulgences with the simple approbation of the Ordinaries. The price of letters of aggregation was not to exceed six Roman crowns or thirty francs. As the bishops had been in the habit of appointing the parish priests as rectors of the sodalities, and as doubts had arisen as to the legality of this, the practice was confirmed in the past and authorized in the future, and the priests thus designated were empowered to bless the scapulars, chaplets, and other objects conferring indulgences on the members.[1] A manual on the subject in 1826 assumes as a matter of course that the priest is at the head of all the confraternities of his parish, and enumerates among their advantages the individual influence which they enable him to exercise over his parishioners,[2] an influence which is strengthened by the obligation of monthly confession.

It would be impossible to catalogue all the confraternities which have been formed within the Church, but a few may be mentioned, which will illustrate the principal objects of their existence and their bearing upon the inordinate development of modern indulgences. Some of them are scarce more than the ancient guilds or modern trades unions absorbed by the Church and modified to adapt them to its purposes. Thus the scriveners and copyists of Rome, in the fifteenth century, were organized into a society which was approved, in 1449, by Nicholas V. This became a confraternity, having its seat in the church of S. Tommaso in Parione, to the members of which, in 1561, Pius IV. granted a *toties quoties* plenary jubilee indulgence for visiting their church on Annunciation day and the feasts of St. John the Evangelist and St. Nicholas, a grace which was confirmed by Clement

[1] Decr. Authent. n. 738, 765.

[2] Instructions pratiques sur les Indulgences et les Confréries, pp. 324, 327. VIe. Éd. Lyon, 1837.

IX. in 1668.[1] Of the same nature is a confraternity of journeymen tailors in Rome, the summary of whose indulgences was approved in 1779.[2] Others again have as their immediate object the performance of works of charity. Some Florentines living in Rome founded, in 1448, an Archconfraternity *della Pietà*, the function of which was the burial of the dead during a pestilence, and in 1488 another known as *della Misericordia*, to give spiritual consolation and burial to condemned criminals, and both of these are recorded as taking part in the care of pilgrims during the jubilee of 1625.[3] The most conspicuous of these associations, however, was that of the SS. Trinità devoted to hospitality and the care of the sick, and organized, in 1548, by San Filippo Neri while yet a layman. It took charge of poor convalescents discharged from the hospitals, who previously had no shelter and who frequently died in the streets, but its greatest sphere of activity was during the jubilees. Its labors, in 1550, attracted wide attention and it received liberal assistance which enabled it, in 1575, to afford shelter to some 365,000 pilgrims, many thousands of whom it nursed during sickness in its hospital. For the jubilee of 1600 its buildings were enlarged; Clement VIII. and his cardinals frequently visited them, and washed the feet of the pilgrims; it was said to have fed as many as 11,000 in a single day, but these figures are doubtful, for one account states the total number assisted at 200,600 and another at 469,000. In 1625 the aggregate is given of 564,237, to each of whom the Duchess of Fano gave a chaplet and medal, and among these were 24,396 sick. In 1650 it received 334,453; in 1675, 280,496; in 1700, 296,097; in 1725, 382,140; in 1750, 194,832; in 1775 Zaccaria speaks of it as still a miracle of Christian hospitality, and in 1825 it lodged and fed for three days 38,844 pilgrims besides 350 members of affiliated brotherhoods. In these kindly ministrations the popes assisted it with money and indulgences, but the latter were comparatively sparing, for they never have been lavished on works of charity as they have been on works of devotion.[4]

[1] Ricci, dei Giubilei universali, pp. 333–7.—Decr. Authent. n. 20.

[2] Decr. Authent. n. 379.

[3] Ricci, *op cit.* pp. 190, 195.

[4] Ricci, *op. cit.* pp. 73-5, 81, 83, 92, 107, 111, 135, 161, 251, 253, 307.—Zaccaria dell' Anno Santo, I. 79, 93, 100, 104, 111, 114, 119–20, 125.—Valerius de Anno Sacro Jubilæi, 1600, pp. x., xxiv., xcv.—Vittorelli, Historia de' Giubilei, pp. 399–400.—Lépicier, Indulgences, etc., p. 340.

There are also confraternities for the furtherance of the temporal and political interests of the Church. Thus, in 1860, at the commencement of the attempts on the temporal power of the papacy, a confraternity was founded for its defence at Vienna, under the name of St. Michael, receiving the warm approbation of Pius IX., which Leo XIII. has repeated. It differs from most of its congeners in the fact that the presiding officers of the sodalities are not necessarily priests. The conditions of membership are simple—merely the daily repetition of a Pater and Ave and the payment of 24 pfenning per annum in aid of the Holy See, and on these easy terms the members can obtain fourteen plenary indulgences per annum, besides the customary ones at entrance and on the death-bed. They also participate in the benefit of the daily mass founded, in 1861, by Pius IX. for those who aid the papacy in money, writing and arms. The confraternity has spread through Europe, but its results have not apparently corresponded to the hopes of the founders. The highest annual amount remitted to Rome by the brotherhood of Vienna has been about 60,000 florins, and in 1891 it was only 5862.[1] A similar body, known as the Leonine Society, founded at St. Louis with the same object, has conditions somewhat more onerous, for the daily prayers are a Pater, Ave and Gloria Patri, and the annual contribution to Peter's pence is one per cent. of the income of the member, while Leo XIII., who is less profuse than his predecessor in the dispensation of the treasure, has only granted to the members two plenaries a year, one on Epiphany and one on St. Peter's and Paul's day.[2] More practical is the Society of St. Raphael, which has become somewhat notorious of late years through the freakish zeal of its German General Secretary, Herr Cahensly of Limburg. It was founded, in 1868, to aid and to preserve in the faith those emigrants whom it cannot dissuade from emigrating. It has its agents, mostly priests, at the ports of embarkation, while a corresponding association in the United States, under the presidency of Bishop Wigger of Newark, looks after the immigrants on arrival. Similar confraternities have been established in Austria and Belgium, and are forming in Italy and France, and unquestionably they must do much to protect from extortion those for whom they care. In Germany the yearly subscription of working members is one mark, of

[1] Beringer, Die Ablässe, pp. 678–80.

[2] Ibid. pp. 680–1.

honorary members six marks; in America, one and five dollars respectively, for which they obtain a plenary at entrance and at death, and one every year on St. Raphael's day, October 24th. This is not much in comparison with the favors bestowed on other confraternities, but as there are no duties or religious observances prescribed, save the indispensable requisite of taking communion and a prayer in church, it is a veritable sale of the indulgence.[1]

While thus there are occasional confraternities organized for objects more or less charitable or worldly, the main purport of the associations is the promotion of devotional exercises. Of these the first place is to be assigned to the Rosary. This is a combination of prayers, the repetition of which is facilitated by a string of a hundred and fifty small beads, divided into decades by larger beads, the whole being duly blessed by a properly authorized priest. Each decade consists of a Pater, ten Aves and one Gloria Patri, and in its complete shape the Apostles' Creed is to be recited on the small crucifix attached to the end, followed by two Paters, three Aves and a Gloria. The fifteen decades are divided into three parts, devoted respectively to the five joyful, the five sorrowful and the five glorious mysteries, on which the devotee should meditate while repeating the prayers, although those incapable of meditation can earn the indulgences by simple devotion.[2] The invention of this formula of prayer and the founding of a confraternity to practice it are attributed to St. Dominic; it is a Dominican institution, and probably the most widely spread of all the brotherhoods.[3] In point of fact, however, the first authentic reference to it is towards the close of the fifteenth century. In 1478 a bull of Sixtus IV. recites that he has heard that in the Dominican church of Cologne there is a confraternity styling itself of the Rosary of the Blessed Virgin, the members of which, thrice a week, repeat fifteen Paters and a hundred and fifty Aves, which they call a rosary, and that there are brethren of the confraternity elsewhere; desiring, therefore, to stimulate this devotion he grants to each member duly performing it an indulgence of seven years and

[1] Beringer, Die Ablässe, pp. 681–5.

[2] Golden Book of the Confraternities, pp. 19–58.—Decr. Authent. n. 644. In 1726 it was decided that the meditation on the mysteries cannot be replaced with meditations on death without forfeiting the indulgences.—Ibid. n. 54.

[3] Beringer, *op. cit.* p. 611.

quarantines on the days of the Nativity, Annunciation and Assumption of the Virgin.[1] The whole matter, confraternity and rosary, was evidently a novelty at the papal court, and that it made no impression is evident from another decree issued the following year. The devotion must have spread rapidly, for, in 1479, François II. of Britanny applied to Sixtus for approbation of a form of prayer known as the Psalter of the Virgin, which some persons were decrying. This is described as the daily recital of a hundred and fifty Aves, prefixing a Pater to each ten Aves. Sixtus, who evidently had forgotten the Cologne confraternity, treats it as a novelty of recent origin in Britanny, and not only approves it, but grants an indulgence of five years and quarantines for every fifty recitations.[2] In 1520 a bull of Leo X., issued at the prayer of the Cologne Dominicans, gives us further information respecting it. St. Dominic, they asserted, had founded a confraternity of the rosary, but it had died out and been forgotten; in 1475 it was revived at Cologne, when, at the request of Frederic III., the papal legate, Alexander, Bishop of Friuli, granted for it an indulgence of a hundred days on the five feasts of the Virgin, and forty days on other days. Then followed the grants of Sixtus IV., and, in 1483, when the general chapter of the Dominicans was held in Rome, Innocent VIII. conceded a plenary, once in life and at death, to all members of the confraternity reciting the rosary weekly, and also to all who were received to the good works of the Order by letters issued gratuitously and not for money. Subsequently Cardinal Raymond, legate to Germany, granted to the members of the confraternity one hundred days for each rosary, to which many bishops added forty days. All this the Cologne Dominicans asked to be confirmed, and their

---

[1] Sixti PP. IV. Bull. *Pastoris vices*, 28 Junii, 1478 (Amort de Indulgent. I. 170). Benedict XIV. (De Festis Lib. II. Cap. xii.) states that Alexander IV. granted an indulgence to a confraternity of the Rosary at Piacenza in 1264, but he cites as authority a bull printed by Campi, which, as we have seen above (p. 471), is merely addressed to a confraternity of the Virgin, and makes no allusion to the rosary.

The customary device of forgery to sustain unfounded claims was not lacking. In 1735, at Ferrara, was published a collection of chronicles of Luminoso da Aposa, a contemporary of St. Dominic, of Gualvaneo Bragia in 1347, and Agostino Anello in 1430, all of whom attributed the rosary to the saint, but Benedict XIV. tells us that they are fictitious.

[2] Sixti PP. IV. Bull. *Ea qua ex fidelium*, 9 Maii, 1479 (Bullar. I. 418).

petition was backed by the Duchess of Juliers, the Margravine of Brandenburg, and other magnates. Leo accordingly approved and confirmed the confraternity and its indulgences, and added ten years and quarantines for each time that the members should recite the rosary thrice a week. Moreover, he granted them the choice of a confessor and empowered him to absolve for reserved cases, except those of the *Cœna Domini*, and to commute vows; nothing, however, was to be exacted for admission to the brotherhood, though voluntary offerings might be accepted.[1] The progressive relaxation in the dispensation of the treasure is illustrated, in 1534, by Clement VII., who, in confirming the above and the Stations of Rome, granted to the members by Leo X., adds that Sixtus IV. had required a daily recitation of the rosary, but this onerous duty rendered many lukewarm, wherefore he extends the day into a week and authorizes the recitation piecemeal; moreover, he adds two years to the five granted by Sixtus for each third of the rosary.[2] Finally, in 1569, the legend of St. Dominic received papal sanction; St. Pius V. describes how, in the Albigensian troubles, Dominic by devising it aroused fresh zeal for the faith and led to its triumph over the heretics, and he hopes for the same result now that the Church is assailed and human wickedness has increased. To this end he confirms the privileges of the confraternity, authorizes it to receive gifts and legacies, renders entrance to it attractive by offering a plenary to all who join it, receive the sacrament, recite a third of the rosary and pray for the Church, to which is added another plenary at death. Besides these indulgences he grants ten years and quarantines to those who on three feasts of the year recite a third and take communion, seven years and quarantines for a rosary recited in a week, or for a third recited on other feasts, and to non-members participating in the monthly processions of the brotherhood.[3] Sixtus V. confirmed all this in 1586; he authorized the Dominican General to erect new branches of the confraternity everywhere, and relaxed some of the conditions of the indulgences in favor of the sick and of those detained by other duties and occupations.[4]

The confraternity of the Rosary was thus fairly launched on the

[1] Leonis PP. X. Bull. *Pastoris æterni*, 1520 (Bullar. I. 621).

[2] Clement. PP. VII. Bull. *Etsi Temporalium*, 1534 (Ibid. p. 695). Confirmed by Paul III. in 1535, and by Julius III. in 1551 (Ibidem).

[3] S. Pii PP. V. Bull. *Consueverunt*, 1569 (Ibid. II. 305).

[4] Sixti PP. V. Bull. *Dum ineffabilis*, 1586 (Ibid. II. 558).

Catholic world, and its development was rapid. In the jubilee of 1600 it had a great procession on October 8th, which Clement VIII. popularized by offering the jubilee indulgence to all who would accompany it and then pay a single visit to the four basilicas. The number was estimated at fifty thousand, and the press was so great that of eighteen cardinals participating in it twelve were obliged to withdraw and seek shelter to save their lives.[1] It is true that Paul V., in his reforms of 1606, revoked the indulgences of the rosary, but he revived them in 1608, and they were again confirmed by Innocent XI. in 1679.[2] As the Franciscans enjoyed the *Via Crucis*, so the rosary was a peculiarly Dominican institution; no confraternities were regular without the approbation or authority of the Dominican General, and, in 1747, it was decreed that those erected by episcopal authority had no part in the indulgences, which constituted its chief attraction. Notwithstanding this many bishops, in virtue of the general faculties granted to them by the Holy See, had no scruple in founding these brotherhoods till, in 1864, the decree of 1747 was decided to be still in force, but, with the customary dread of creating scandal, it was announced that out of consideration for the souls involved all these existing irregular ones were validated.[3] To erect one requires not only a diploma from the Dominican General, but it must be organized by a Dominican priest authorized to do so; still, when there are no Dominicans nor a likelihood of their coming, the Provincial can empower a priest designated by the bishop to organize it, enroll members and bless the rosaries, though whether the rosaries require to be blessed, or whether it is necessary to use one at all, is an intricate question, not definitely settled. The rector of the sodality must be designated by the Dominican General, who generally selects the priest of the church where it is founded. The rule is that there can be but one such brotherhood in a town; in 1863 Pius IX. confirmed this regulation, but validated all previously erected in disregard of it. No entrance fees can be exacted, but spontaneous "alms" can be received as well as legacies and other gifts, and members can beg for the sodality by episcopal licence.[4]

---

[1] Valerius de Sacro Anno, 1600, p. lxxix.

[2] Van Ranst Opusc. de Indulg. p. 188.

[3] Decr. Authent. n. 157, 754.

[4] Beringer, Die Ablässe, pp. 612, 614–16.—Acta S. Sedis, etc., pro Societate SS. Rosarii, I. 123–4 (Romæ, 1890).

The magnitude and importance of the confraternity may be guessed from

In the modern profusion of indulgences those of the confraternity of the Rosary have naturally been increased, notably by Pius IX. in 1851, yet are they less than we shall see enjoyed by other bodies of less antiquity and dignity. There is one peculiarity about them which markedly illustrates the relaxation of recent times—that although by the rules of the brotherhood each member is bound to recite a full rosary weekly, yet, by a decision of 1877, this is not required to obtain the indulgences. Of these there are, of course, numerous partials which it not worth while to enumerate, as plenaries have become so common that they alone seem to deserve consideration. As regards the latter, besides those on inscription, reception, and the death-bed, there are thirty-seven days in the year when they can be obtained, on the very moderate conditions of attending the processions of the brotherhood or visiting a church where it has a chapel and praying for intention. For most of them confession and communion are prerequisites, but for some only the intention to confess at the regular period suffices; for the one acquired at reception the recitation of five decades of the rosary is necessary. The Stations of Rome can also be enjoyed by visiting five altars of a church. In addition to these there is a very remarkable indulgence which the members share with all the faithful. In 1572 Pius V. established the feast of the Rosary on the first Sunday of October, in honor of the victory of Lepanto, which was ascribed to the interposition of the Virgin. This was extended to the whole church, in 1716, by Clement XI., at the request of Charles VI. in commemoration of the overthrow of the Turks at Temesvar, which was ascribed to a procession held on the same day at Rome by the confraternity of the Rosary for the success of the Christian arms. Whoever on that day, after confession and communion, enters a church where there is a chapel of the brotherhood, after first vespers, and prays for the intention of the pope, secures a plenary, and this, like the Portiuncula, he can repeat *toties quoties* and apply to souls in purgatory.[1]

The indulgences of the Rosary are not confined to members of the confraternity. The pious who perform this devotion on a rosary properly blessed have been rewarded with various graces, of which

the size of this manual for the guidance of its officials and members, containing about 1900 octavo pages.

[1] Beringer, Die Ablässe, pp. 270–1, 619–21.—Decr. Authent. n. 643, 644.

it is only necessary to mention the principal one, granted by Pius IX., in 1851, which consists of a plenary on the last Sunday of each month for those who weekly recite three times at least one-third of a rosary.[1] Yet the proper recitation of the whole fifteen decades of which the devotion consists is a laborious process, consuming more time than even the pious laity can well spare in this hurried age. Consequently it has fallen into almost complete desuetude except in religious houses,[2] and the Church, with its customary sagacity in adapting itself to the weakness of the faithful, has devised a labor-saving method of rendering it less onerous without diminishing its rewards, through an application of the fruitful principle of the Communion of Saints, by which merits are communicated without diminution. In 1820 Pius VII. decreed that alternate recitation by two or more persons of the prayers required to gain indulgences, such as the Rosary, the Litanies, the Angelus, the De Profundis etc., sufficed to win them by all engaged in the pious work.[3] This presupposed assembling for the purpose, and was facilitated, in 1858, by Pius IX. in a decree that in companies meeting for this exercise it was necessary only for one of them to actually hold a rosary in the hand.[4] The idea received a further development, in 1826, by Marie Pauline Jaricot, who associated together fifteen persons, each of whom should, at his convenience, recite a decade daily, and thus the rosary would get itself said every day. Gregory XVI. hailed this as a promising expedient to revive the languishing devotion and bestowed on the members of these associations a plenary on the third Sunday of each month and on fifteen other feast-days. Cardinal Lambruschini was appointed head of the associations, with two deputies named by the pope, but when they died no successors were nominated, and the devotion diminished until, in 1877, Pius IX. placed it under the charge of the Dominican General. It is known as the Living Rosary, and is not strictly a confraternity, but where there is a brotherhood of the Rosary its rector has charge of the associations.[5]

---

[1] Raccolta, p. 205.

[2] "Many allege that the ordinary rosary is too long, and that their occupations and duties allow them not time enough to say it. Hence it is that the rosary is practised only by very few; in fact, it may be said to be confined as a daily devotion to religious communities."—Golden Book of the Confraternities, p. 69.

[3] Raccolta, p. xiv.

[4] Decr. Authent. n. 716.

[5] Decr. Authent. Append. n. 19.—Beringer, pp. 625–7.—Raccolta, p. 437

Akin to this, but more elaborate, is the Perpetual Rosary, founded about 1635, by the Dominican Timoteo Ricci in Bologna, the object of which is to render an unceasing cult to the Virgin. Each group of this is formed of a division of months and a section of days. There are twelve prefects of months, each of whom selects thirty-one prefects of days; each of the latter adjoins to himself twenty-four members, to each of whom is assigned an hour of the day or night in which to recite the rosary, so that as soon as the adoration of one ceases another takes it up, and there is no break throughout the year. It was popular at first, but it died out, to be revived in our time, and application was made, in 1867, to Pius IX. for the customary stimulus of indulgences, with the information that already there were a hundred thousand members. Pius greeted it warmly, and in the hope that the Virgin might thus be led to put an end to heresy and repress the designs of audacious men he granted a plenary to each prefect on the day when his functions commence and one to each member when he performs his hour of prayer. Lavish as was this dispensation of the treasure it did not prevent the Peace of Versailles and the occupation of Rome, but it succeeded in popularizing the association, which is said in Belgium alone to number 114,598 members. In 1889 the Bishop of Moulins supplicated Leo XIII. to join the association of his diocese; the pontiff graciously assented and selected the hour of 11 to 12 P.M. on the first day of the month, saying that he always at that hour recited the rosary in his chapel. This is not strictly a confraternity, but, like the other devotions of the rosary, it is under the care of the Dominicans.[1]

The Jesuits have not been behind the other Orders in utilizing the agency of associations in obtaining control over the faithful, and the practical spirit which directs their efforts has secured from the Holy See an even larger measure of graces than their rivals. The Congregation of the Blessed Virgin—or to use its full title, the Primaprimaria Congregation of the Annunciation of the Most Blessed Immaculate Virgin Mary—originated in Syracuse, was carried to

(Ed. 1855, omitted in that of 1886).—Jouhanneaud, Dict. des Indulgences, pp. 1172–4.

There is a small charge for membership in these associations—in Ireland one penny monthly, in the United States six cents.—Golden Book, p. 67.

[1] Decr. Authent n. 767.—Beringer, p. 623–5.

Rome in 1563, spread rapidly throughout Europe, and at the prayer of the General Aquaviva was confirmed and enriched with indulgences by Gregory XIII. in 1584. Favored by successive popes, some of whom and many cardinals were numbered among its members, it flourished greatly. In 1664 the Jesuit missions in China boasted that they had four thousand Marian congregations among their converts. On the suppression of the Society of Jesus, the popes preserved the institution, and, in 1824, when Leo XII. handed it back to the Order, the Primaprimaria in Rome had 2476 associated sodalities. Under the vigorous management of the Jesuits it speedily recovered its former prominence; from 1829 to July, 1892, no less than 16,674 sodalities were aggregated to the Primaprimaria, of which 4758 were accessions in the last ten years. It is a body thoroughly organized for practical work. Each congregation is presided over by a priest designated by the bishop; there is a prefect selected by the members, one or two assistants, a secretary and a number of consultors. The exercises recommended are three Aves, morning and evening, daily pious reading or part of a rosary, weekly meetings for pious discourse, daily attendance at mass, monthly communion and yearly general confession. The most significant feature, however, of these recommendations is one which prescribes an exemplary life and zealous aid for all interests of the Church. That much is to be expected from a body thus organized would appear from the extraordinary indulgences bestowed upon it to render it attractive. Benedict XIV., by his "Golden Bull" of 1747, granted to the members, besides the customary plenaries on entrance and at death, and the Stations of Rome for visiting a Jesuit church and reciting seven Paters and Aves, a weekly plenary for attending the meetings, conditioned only on confession and communion and visiting a chapel of the Congregation and praying for the concord of Christian princes, the extirpation of heresy and the exaltation of the Church. There are plenaries also for six feasts in the year, and members who do not attend the meetings can gain two more. There is also a plenary for every one, including members, for visiting a chapel on the saint's day of the sodality and on the feasts of the Virgin.[1] Spiritual graces so extensive for so little work would indicate the importance attached to keeping the mem-

[1] Decr. Authent. n. 174, 175.—Beringer, pp. 643–52.

bers fully in touch with the organization and animated with its spirit.

The Redemptorists have their arch confraternity for the relief of souls in purgatory, under the title of the Assumption of the Virgin, the object of which is the performance of pious works for the departed. Founded in Rome in 1840, before a quarter of a century had elapsed it spread throughout the Catholic world and boasted of four hundred affiliated brotherhoods with over a million of members. Besides plenaries on admission and death, it has twenty-six in the year and the Stations of Rome, together with a large array of partials, and all its altars are privileged.[1]

All confraternities, however, are not attached to special religious Orders. The devotion of the Sacred Heart of Jesus was ordered by Christ himself in repeated visions vouchsafed to the Blessed Marie Alacoque, the nun of Paray-le-Monial, in 1675. A few brotherhoods were founded, but it attracted little attention until, in 1728, it was confirmed by Benedict XIII. and enriched with indulgences. S. Leonardo da Porto Maurizio took it up, and, in 1729, established a brotherhood in Rome, which, in 1732, was erected into an archconfraternity and empowered to aggregate to itself subordinate organizations, which, in 1743, already numbered 1700. It then declined, but when the Synod of Pistoja classed it among new and erroneous devotions, Pius VI. condemned the assertion as false, rash, pernicious, offensive to pious ears and insulting to the Holy See. In spite of this papal defence it virtually became extinct, but was revived in 1803, and in the decade of 1830–40 it had acquired some ten thousand affiliated confraternities. Its indulgences are generous; besides plenaries on reception and death-bed there are two every month, as well as on eleven feasts in the year, the only essential works for which are a daily Pater and Ave and Creed and the ejaculation :

> O sweetest Heart of Jesus I implore
> That I may ever love thee more and more !

Even without this ejaculation the members can obtain the Stations of Rome by visiting churches and praying for the intention of the pope.[2]

[1] Müller, Purgatorian Consoler, Chapter VIII.

[2] Golden Book, p. 173.—Beringer, pp. 592–5.—Raccolta, pp. 142–3 (Ed. 1855).—Pii PP. VI. Bull. *Auctorem Fidei*, Art. 62.

It is significant of the preponderance which the Virgin is attaining in popular devotion that in spite of these enormous and easily attained indulgences the more modern confraternity of the Sacred Heart of Mary should have outstripped completely its older rival of the Heart of Jesus, founded though the latter was by the direct command of Christ. Attempts seem to have been made to organize such an association in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, but it languished, died out, and was forgotten. In December, 1836, however, Father Des Genettes, of the church of Nôtre Dame des Victoires in Paris, undertook to re-establish it. The effect was prodigious; in that parish of over 26,000 souls, only 720 hosts were consumed in 1835; in 1837 the number rose to 9550, and in 1838 to over 11,000. In 1838 Gregory XVI. erected the association into an archconfraternity, and by 1892 it had 18,710 affiliated sodalities with more than thirty million members, and was supporting a monthly journal. Partly perhaps this may be explained by the "miraculous medal" presented to each member on admission, which he is recommended to wear always and to frequently repeat the prayer on it—"O Mary, conceived without sin, pray for us whose refuge is in thee!" The indulgences of the confraternity, moreover, are abundant and are obtained on the easiest terms. Membership is acquired by simple enrolment and without payment. All members ought to say an Ave daily for the objects of the confraternity, but this is unnecessary to obtain the indulgences, except one plenary a year which is conditioned on it. This is a trifling matter, however, for there are two a month for visiting a church and praying for the intention of the pope, besides thirteen feasts on which they can be obtained, and the customary ones on entrance and at death, together with participation in all the good works of the brotherhood.[1]

This overflowing cult of the Virgin has naturally reflected back upon St. Joseph and St. Anne, who share her exaltation in the revelations of Maria de Agreda and Anne Katherine Emmerich, based on the Apocryphal Gospels. We can thus understand the curious outbreak of devotion for St. Joseph which is the modern fashion; he is selected as the patron of the Church and Pius IX. stimulated his cult energetically. The month of March is dedicated to him, as

---

[1] Jouhanneaud, Dict. des Indulgences, pp. 619, 658–9.—Raccolta, p. 188 (Ed. 1885).—Golden Book, pp. 212–14.—Beringer, pp. 664–5.—Decr. Authent. n. 574.

May is to Mary. By a decree of April 27, 1865, any one performing an act of devotion to him on each day of March obtains a plenary, just as one on each day of May to Mary. By rescripts of January 20, 1856, and July 5, 1861, Pius confirmed a perpetual cult of St. Joseph by associations of which each member agrees to devote a day in his honor, so that if 365 members are obtained the devotion never ceases, and for this they receive plenaries on joining and at death, on the day of devotion, on January 23d, March 19th (the feast of St. Joseph), and on all the feasts of the Virgin.[1] This, however, is a somewhat laborious method of gaining indulgences and does not seem to have become popular. Much simpler are the associations of the Holy Family, devoted to contemplating the virtues of Jesus, Mary, and Joseph, for which, in 1892, Leo XIII. granted twenty-seven plenaries per annum, besides numerous partials for some simple prayers and observances.[2] More directly devoted to St. Joseph is the Archconfraternity of the Cord of St. Joseph, which presents elements commending it strongly to the unquestioning faith of believers. The Bollandists relate that, in 1657, a nun of Antwerp, given over by her physicians, caused a cord to be blessed in the name of St. Joseph, wound it around her and was cured. This miracle chanced to be copied in a book entitled *Month of March in Honor of St. Joseph*, which had a considerable circulation in Verona, where various patients desperately sick adopted the expedient and recovered. The devotion spread, not only for the cure of disease, but for the preservation of chastity; the Bishop of Verona sent to Rome an account of it, with the formula of benediction; the Congregation of Indulgences, after mature consideration, approved of it by decree of September 19, 1859; Pius IX. declared *primaria* the Archconfraternity of the Cord of St. Joseph and enriched it with indulgences. All members must be registered in the books of the Archconfraternity, but the rectors of the affiliated sodalities have power of blessing the cords, and no formalities are required in putting them on, as is the case with scapulars; they can be sent to those desirous of using them, who thus become entitled to all the indulgences attached to them. It is thus a simple fetish or amulet.[3] Innumerable are the miracles

[1] Raccolta, pp. 446–9 (Ed. 1855).

[2] Leonis PP. XIII. Litt. Apost. *Quum nuper*, 20 Junii 1892 (Acta, XII. 161).

[3] Huguet, Notice sur l'Archiconfrèrie du Cordon de S. Joseph. The cord

related as operated by it, from procuring permanent situations for the unemployed to the cure of the most desperate case of disease.[1] The rules of the confraternity are to imitate St. Joseph by obeying strictly the sixth and ninth commandments, to avoid all occasions of temptation, to examine the conscience rigorously, to observe the month of March in honor of St. Joseph, to receive the sacrament monthly and on the feast of St. Joseph, March 19th, January 23d, and the third Sunday after Easter, and to recite daily seven glorias, but these religious duties are only counselled and are not requisite for gaining the indulgences, nor even is wearing the cord. There are sixteen plenaries during the year, on the feasts of St. Joseph, Christ, and the Virgin, and also on the anniversaries of dead associates, which may be numerous. Moreover all altars are privileged for the souls of members.[2]

It was not left for the confraternity of St. Joseph to adopt a girdle as a distinguishing mark. We have seen the brotherhood of the Cord of St. Francis, founded by Sixtus V., in 1585, and one of the oldest is that known as the *Cincturati*, from the black leather belt, with a black bone ring worn by the members. It is connected with the Augustinians, who alone have the power to bless the belt, and is known as the Confraternity of St. Augustin and St. Monica. Formerly it was in high favor, and was frequently alluded to as the model of such associations, but apparently more modern devotions have cast it into the background, though we are told that it is the richest in indulgences of all the girdle-wearing brotherhoods.[3] In 1712 it

---

can be of linen, cotton, or wool; it has seven knots, symbolical of the seven joys and seven sorrows of Joseph, and is worn as a girdle under the garments. Ibid. p. 15

These cords are advertised "parfaitement conformes aux dernières décisions de Rome" at five francs per 100 in cotton and ten francs in linen.

Of Père Huguet's little book sixty thousand copies were sold in a few months.

[1] Huguet, Vertu miraculeuse du Cordon de Saint Joseph. Paris, 1869. There is, or was, a monthly journal issued in Paris "Le Propagation de la Dévotion à Saint Joseph."

[2] Huguet, Notice, etc.—Beringer, pp. 686-7. It is perhaps suggestive of the distinction between works of charity and of devotion that the St. Joseph's Guild of Baltimore, for the assistance of the colored population of the South, approved by Cardinal Gibbons in 1891, has no indulgences. Members are only promised participation in certain masses to be celebrated in their behoof.

[3] Tagliaferri, Sacro Diario delle Indulgenze della Compagnia della Cintura

had to be rebuked for issuing a summary of indulgences containing some that were false or had been revoked, and, in 1749, a quarrel over it between the two branches of the Augustinian Order, the bare-footed and the shod, was decided in favor of the former.[1]

The Cincturati have scapulars as well as belts, which assimilate them to the scapular-wearing confraternities. The scapular, as the vehicle of numberless indulgences, is a peculiar institution, meriting some attention at our hands. We have seen (pp. 264 sqq.) the enormous success of the brown scapular of the Carmelites, which has brought nearly the whole Catholic population into their confraternity. The Servites seem to have been the first to follow their example with the black scapular of the confraternity of the Seven Sorrows of Mary, but we may reasonably doubt the accuracy of the tradition which claims for it antiquity reaching to the thirteenth century and an immediate popularity among all classes which brought into its membership St. Louis and Rodolph of Hapsburg. That it is older than most of its competitors would seem evident from its religious duties being more serious than those of more recent bodies, and, as long ago as 1611, Paul V. granted a plenary to all members participating in the monthly processions held by the brotherhood in the Servite churches. The scapular and membership are indissolubly connected. Each member is required to recite daily seven Paters and Aves and to be present at the weekly service of the Rosary performed in the Servite churches on Friday or Sunday; he must take the sacrament on seven feasts of the year and fast on the vigils; he must attend the yearly procession of the brethren; he must often visit the chapel or altar of the brotherhood and pray at it, and on the death of a member the rest must recite seven Paters and Aves for him. All this is not imperative, but without it the indulgences are forfeited. These latter scarce correspond, according to modern standards, to the onerous character of the observances. There is a plenary at reception and at death, one at the chief feast of the brotherhood, one for attendance at the monthly procession and one on Passion Sunday, in addition to which the members can enjoy the Stations of

della B. V. Maria. Foligno, 1715. Tagliaferri was Augustinian Provincial of Umbria, and his enumeration of the indulgences of the *Cincturati* is doubtless official. They are very numerous, including some large ones claimed as being granted *oraculo vivæ vocis*, and others that are evidently fictitious.

[1] Decr. Authent. n. 31, 148, 162, 180, 427.—Beringer, p. 695.

Rome by visiting a Servite church on the appointed days. In 1888, moreover, Leo XIII. granted a *toties quoties* plenary, applicable to the dead, for visiting on the third Sunday in September a Servite church, or a church where the confraternity is canonically established, and praying for intention, but this is open to all the faithful, and is not confined to the members of the brotherhood.[1]

More liberal are the graces of the white scapular of the Order of the Trinity for the Redemption of Captives. The Order was founded by St. Juan de Matha and St. Félix de Valois towards the end of the twelfth century, and was approved by Innocent III. in 1198. To supply it with funds for its pious work a confraternity was subsequently established in connection with it, having as a symbol a white scapular with a red and blue cross. At present the alms of the members are employed to defray the expenses of the brotherhood and to redeem negro children from slavery, though almsgiving is not a condition of the indulgences. There would seem to be no special devotional duties prescribed, but the brethren are expected to be zealous in venerating the mystery of the Trinity and to be liberal in donations for the object of the confraternity. They enjoy a plenary on assuming the scapular and at death if they are wearing it; also for voyaging to infidel lands to redeem captives and on the return. Moreover, there are nine feasts on which they can obtain plenaries by visiting a church and praying; there is one for each participation in the monthly processions of the brotherhood, another every month for the daily recital of three Paters, Aves and Glorias; there are ten feasts on which the rector can grant the brethren a benediction, with general absolution and a plenary, and the Stations of Rome are obtainable by duly visiting Trinitarian churches, while all altars are privileged for the brethren.[2]

Besides the white, brown, and black scapulars, which are conditioned on entering their respective brotherhoods, there are other scapulars enriched with indulgences which may conveniently be considered here. Of these the most conspicuous are the blue of the Immaculate Conception, and the red of the Passion.

---

[1] Decr. Auth. n. 172, 173.—Beringer, pp. 273, 659–60.—Guglielmi, Recueil des Indulgences, p. 243.

[2] Decr. Authent. n. 683.—Beringer, pp. 556–61.

Early in the seventeenth century the Venerable Ursula Benincasa, a Theatin, had a vision of the Virgin and Child, who promised that all who should wear a small blue scapular in honor of the Immaculate Conception should enjoy special graces. She commenced to make and distribute them, and they had much currency; in 1671 Clement X. authorized the Theatins to bless and impose the blue scapular; in 1710 Clement XI. granted some indulgences for wearing it, and in 1851 Pius IX. empowered the Theatin General to authorize other priests to bless and impose it. The assumption of the scapular does not involve entrance into a brotherhood, nor does it impose any obligations, while the indulgences which it confers are on the largest scale. There are sixty-four days in the year on which plenaries can be gained; the Stations of Rome are to be had for visiting a Theatin church and praying on the appointed days; the indulgences of the Seven Churches can be had twice a month by visiting the seven altars of a Theatin church, and those of Jerusalem and the Holy Land twice a month by praying in a Theatin church. Besides these and above all, the recitation of six Paters, Aves and Glorias obtains every time it is performed the indulgences of the Seven Churches, the Portiuncula, Jerusalem, and Compostella. There are no conditions expressed for these; presumably they mostly require confession and communion, but when, in 1856, the Congregation of Indulgences was asked whether these sacraments were necessary for the enjoyment of the latter *toties quoties* one, it replied in the negative.[1] These are all applicable to the dead, and surely escape from purgatory for the penitent and his friends cannot be had on easier terms than by the simple expedient of wearing the blue scapular of the Immaculate Conception.

After this maximum liberality in the dispensation of the treasure the indulgences of the red scapular of the Passion would appear somewhat common-place, and yet the good fathers of Trent would have looked aghast at them. In 1846 a sister of charity had several visions of Christ holding a red scapular, on one side of which was a crucifix, with the instruments of the Passion beneath it, and around it the legend "Holy Passion of our Lord Jesus Christ, redeem us!"

---

[1] Guglielmi, Recueil des Indulgences, pp. 114–5.—Beringer, pp. 374–6.—Blot, Indulgences qu'on peut gagner chez soi, p. 21.—Cloquet, Les plus faciles indulgences, p. 30.—Decr. Authent. n. 596, 701.

on the other side the hearts of Jesus and Mary with a shining cross, and the inscription "Holy Hearts of Jesus and Mary, save us!" In one of the visions he said, "All wearing this scapular will receive on every Friday a great increase of faith, hope and charity." The General of the Lazarists, to whom she related these visions, thought little of them till, being in Rome in June, 1847, he chanced to mention them to Pius IX. The impressionable pope was much interested, and at once empowered all Lazarist priests to bless these scapulars and impose them, and, in 1848, gave the Lazarist General a faculty to authorize other priests to do the same. The wearing of the scapular imposes no obligations, while the plenaries which it confers are one at its assumption, another at death, and one every Friday for confession, communion, meditation for a time on the Passion and prayer for the intention of the pope.[1]

Besides these there are a black scapular of the Passionists and one of S. Camillo de Lellis, the patron of the sick, but we are told that they are little worn, and they can be passed over.[2] There is also a red scapular or girdle worn by the Archconfraternity of the Precious Blood of Jesus Christ, founded, in 1808, by Padre Albertini, approved, in 1809, by Pius VII., and endowed with indulgences in 1815, but as these are not attached to the scapular it hardly belongs to the class which we are considering. The indulgences obtainable by the members are however sufficiently numerous—a plenary on admission and at death, one a month on days selected at will, on thirty-five feasts during the year and on every day in which an hour is spent in mental or vocal prayer or in meditation on the Passion and the sorrows of the Virgin.[3] There is also a scapular known as the Heart of Jesus, which is rather an amulet. It originated with Marie Alacoque, consisting of a small piece of white woollen stuff with an embroidered or woven picture of the Heart of Jesus and the legend "Halt! the Heart of Jesus is here." It was worn to protect from pestilence, and was largely used; we are even told that Benedict XIV. sent a number of them to Maria Leczinski. Under the Revolution the wearing of it was regarded as an ominous proof of fanaticism, as in the case of Marie Antoinette. It was not en-

---

[1] Guglielmi, pp. 359–64, 371–4.—Beringer, p. 372.

[2] Beringer, p. 371.

[3] Guglielmi, pp. 342–7.—Beringer, pp. 588–91.

riched with an indulgence until 1872, when Pius IX. granted a daily partial of a hundred days for wearing it and saying a Pater, Ave and Gloria. It requires no blessing and the inscription is not imperative.[1]

In this enumeration of a portion of the numerous confraternities fostered by the Church I have omitted all reference to the abundant partial indulgences obtainable by the members, for, however much these were prized in the earlier periods, they seem insignificant alongside of the plenaries so lavishly distributed. The list might be largely extended, but enough has been given to indicate how eagerly the formation and growth of these bodies have been stimulated and how important a portion they form of the ecclesiastical organization. It has been a skilful use of the gregarious instincts of men thus to allure them to form associations which are part of the Church itself, and which are ceaselessly under the watchful eye and directing hand of the parish priest. Perhaps this may explain, partially at least, the hostility with which all secret societies are regarded and the ban which is threatened for joining them. They withdraw the individual from the control of the Church, they give him the social intercourse which he needs in a form indifferent or possibly antagonistic to its interests, and they weaken the attractions of the sodality.

To one outside of the pale of Catholicism it is not easy to understand the mental operations which render this infinite reduplication of plenary and partial indulgences seductive to the believer. It would seem to be a parody or a caricature of the system to offer weekly or even monthly plenaries, as is so lavishly done. If there be any truth in the dictum of the schoolmen, piously conserved through the ages by the theologians—"tantum valent quantum sonant"—the eager seeking for their indefinite multiplication would seem to be an aberration, only justified by a deep-seated unrecognized consciousness that they do not give what they promise. Yet the believer is not satisfied even with the multitudinous pardons of the blue or the brown scapular. He asks for more, and the Church, ever anxious to bind him in dependence by meeting his demands, assures him that no matter how many confraternities he may join he can gain all the accumulated indulgences of each by performing the trivial works prescribed for them. If in so doing he chances to obtain on a single

[1] Beringer, pp. 379–80.

day two or three plenaries, each requiring communion, the condition is waived in his favor and a single sacrament suffices.[1] If among these confraternities there are several in which the indulgences are attached to a scapular he is not exposed to the annoyance of wearing them all individually, but the different ones can be superimposed on each other and attached to a single pair of tapes. The attempt was made to simplify even this by conjoining the different colors and figures in a single piece of cloth, by weaving or sewing and embroidery, but, as we have seen (p. 264), this was pronounced irregular in 1868. Apparently this did not put an end to the custom, for, in 1884, Leo XIII. validated all imperfect scapulars theretofore worn in good faith.[2] It would require considerable calculation to compute the number of plenary and partial indulgences annually attainable by a devotee wearing a compound scapular composed of the white, black, brown, red and blue. Yet scapulars thus put together can be purchased ready made in the shops for a very moderate price.

Before leaving this portion of our subject it may be worth while to allude to a confraternity of recent organization which has interest not so much because of the indulgences conceded to it as on account of its illustrating the significant recrudescence of medievalism that distinguishes our time. The Veronica or Sudarium—the veil with which Veronica wiped the face of Christ on the way to Calvary, and which retained the impress of his features, is well known as one of the most precious treasures of the Vatican basilica. Tradition universally accepted, we are told, relates that when Tiberius was dying of leprosy he heard from Pilate of the wonders wrought by Christ, and sent his friend Volusianus to Palestine to have the thaumaturge brought to Rome. The mission was too late; Christ had already been crucified, but Veronica, who had experienced the micaculous efficacy of the Sudarium, offered to cure Tiberius with it; she was carried to Rome, and on touching it he was instantly restored to health. She preserved the priceless treasure and gave it to Pope Clement, through whom it was transmitted to his successors.[3] It

[1] Decr. Authent. n. 524, 534.

[2] Decr. Authent. n. 772.—Beringer, p. 371.

[3] Janvier, Il Culto del Santo Volto. Versione del Francese, pp. 23, 35 (Cremona, 1889).

This universally accepted tradition is of modern invention. The earliest

happened, however, that her veil was folded three-ply when it performed its kindly office, and the impress of the divine Face remained on all. One of these Veronica gave to the city of Zante, while on her way to Rome, and another was confided to St. Euphrasius when he was sent by St. Peter to assist in evangelizing Spain and became bishop of Jaen. It was piously preserved there, and carefully hidden during the Saracenic domination, to be brought forth when St. Ferdinand reconquered the city; he used it as his standard in the campaigns which recovered Córdova and Seville, and it was not restored to Jaen until after his death. Since then it has been retouched until little trace of the original is left, but when exposed to popular veneration on good Friday, Annunciation and All-Saints it is surrounded by crowds who eagerly touch the glass protecting it with chaplets, medals, and other pious objects to be endowed with a portion of its sanctity.[1]

---

reference to the Sudarium occurs in Bede, who relates (De Locis Sanctis, Cap. 11) that it was discovered in his time, after having been preserved for generations in the family of a pious Jew who stole it at the crucifixion. It had always brought good fortune to its possessors. Baronius accepts this without qualification and fixes the date at 678 (Annal. ann. 678, n. 14), showing that up to the end of the sixteenth century the present story had not been thought of.

Veronica's remains are entombed in the Vatican, though the precise spot is not known. She is also buried in Bordeaux, where, in 1882, the Archbishop, Cardinal Bonnet, opened the tomb to give a fragment of her to his friend, Bellot des Minières, Bishop of Poitiers. According to the revelations of Anna Katherine Emmerich, she died and reposes in Jerusalem.—Ibid. pp. 30–33.

[1] Janvier, pp. 84–93. This image is known as the Santa Faz, or Cara de Dios, or Santo Rostro. There is another tradition, according to which Honorius III. sent it to St. Ferdinand in order to encourage him in his struggle with the Infidel, but the story in the text is virtually admitted by Clement VII. in a bull of December 20, 1529, granting an indulgence to the church of Jaen, confirmed by Julius III. in 1553.

Spain was prolific in the Santa Faz. There is one at Alicante, an ancient copy of that of Rome, to which the people always have recourse in pestilence, drought, inundation, and other misfortunes, and all vessels when arriving salute with their flags the convent of Clares, in which it is kept.—Ibid. pp. 107–12.

Then there is a Santo Rostro in Osa de la Vega—a painting of Veronica holding the Sudarium. In March, 1644, the face shone and shed blood and tears, and repeated the miracle the next day when carried to the parish church; the priest wiped it with *carporales*, and showed the marks of the blood to the crowd; they are still preserved, and the stains remain perfectly fresh. In 1674 Clement X. granted indulgences, including a perpetual jubilee to the chapel in which it is kept. In 1676 a confraternity of the Santo Rostro was organized

The pre-eminence of the Veronica of the Vatican is, however, uncontested. Traces of its existence are said to be found in early times, as when, in 608, Boniface IV. dedicated the church of S. Maria ai Martiri, where it was annually shown on the anniversary of the dedication, May 13th, until in 707 John VII. built in the Vatican the chapel of the Virgine del Presepio and transferred it

---

with a scapular, to which Clement gave the customary indulgences. It died out but has been revived of late years, and has made great progress, especially in the Philippines.—Ib. pp. 97–107.

There is also one which is said to have fallen into the hands of the Moors, who slashed it with knives, when it shed blood in torrents, and who cast it into the flames, when it refused to burn. Rescued from them, it formed one of the prominent relics of the cathedral of Toledo until begged of the archbishop by Isabella of France, wife of Philip IV. She gave it to her daughter Maria Teresa, who brought it to France on her marriage with Louis XIV., and in 1683 gave it to the Carmelite convent which she founded in Paris. It narrowly escaped destruction during the Revolution, but when the scattered nuns reassembled, in 1798, they brought it back to their convent where it is still an object of great veneration (Ib. pp. 93–7). As it is described as an oil painting on canvas, the antiquity ascribed to it is, of course, apocryphal.

Lucca also boasts of a Santo Volto of especial holiness—a crucifix larger than life, the cross of oak and the Christ of cedar of Lebanon. Nicodemus, who assisted Joseph of Arimathea to bury the Saviour, was an expert carver, and when he took refuge at Ramla conceived the idea of representing the awful scene which he had witnessed. He finished it, except the head, which he despaired of fitly rendering, and had recourse to prayer, when on awakening from a deep sleep he found the work completed. Gualfredo, a Piedmontese bishop, found it in Palestine and put it in a boat, which started by itself and carried the image to Lucca. The miracles which it wrought soon spread its fame throughout Europe and brought pilgrims in thousands, so that by the thirteenth century fifty hospitals had been erected for their entertainment. The Lucchese elected the Santo Volto as their king, all contracts were drawn in its name, and its image was on their coins until removed, April 26, 1858, by order of the grand duke, who lost his throne the next year. A confraternity of the Santo Volto was early formed and largely organized, but in the sixteenth century was merged into that of the Santo Sacramento. The escape of Lucca from the cholera in 1835 was ascribed to the Santo Volto, and in 1837 the archbishop reorganized the confraternity, which in a few years numbered 10,000 members.—Ibid. pp. 112–29.

A somewhat similar relic is the winding-sheet in which Christ was laid in the sepulchre, preserved at Chambery and authenticated by Pius II., Sixtus IV., and Julius II. It presents a complete double image of the Saviour, front and back, and of all his wounds, more numerous than those related in the gospels. —Paleotto, Esplicazione del Lenzuolo, Bologna, 1598.

thither.[1] Innocent III. had much veneration for it, as was manifested by the incident (p. 184) of the portent of its turning itself face downward. He, in fact, in 1208, ordered an annual procession on the Sunday following the octave of the Epiphany, in which the Veronica was carried to the Hospital of Santo Spirito in Saxia, where it was exposed to the veneration of the multitude, and this ceremony was preserved until the time of Sixtus IV.[2] Under Innocent III. moreover was commenced the striking of medals with a representation of the Santo Volto. These had so wide a demand that the dealers in them were known as *mercanti di Veronichi;* in the English vernacular they were called "vernacles," and when Chaucer tells us of his Pardoner that "A vernacle had he sewed upon his cap," it shows that such an object was necessary for the completeness of a pious outfit.

The papal policy has varied with regard to allowing copies to be made of the Veronica. Anciently it was forbidden under pain of excommunication, and for centuries the only authentic one was considered to be that obtained, in 1249, by Sibylla, Abbess of Montreuil-les-Dames, near Laon, whose brother, afterward Urban IV., was treasurer of the Vatican. With much difficulty he wrung from Innocent IV. permission to have it copied, and the pope himself is said to have presided at the sitting. The Sudarium was brought forth, but when the painter studied it to commence his work he suddenly fainted, and, on reviving, found the copy executed so perfectly

---

[1] Janvier, pp. 35–7. All this is modern invention. Anastasius tells us nothing of the kind (De Vitis Rom. Pontiff. n. LXIX., LXXXVIII.).

[2] Innoc. PP. III. Regest. x. 179.—Ejusd. Gesta n. cxliv.—Bullar. Vatican. I. 90, 110, 133.

Sixtus IV., about 1471, adopted the present ceremony, in which on the day indicated by Innocent, and on the Monday of Pentecost, the Archconfraternity of S. Spirito in Saxia march in procession to St. Peter's, and the Veronica is exhibited to them. Three times a year also it is exhibited to the clerics and foundlings of S. Spirito in memory of its former visits to them.—Janvier, pp. 43–5.

Dante represents St. Bernard as using the Veronica as an illustration—

> Quale è colui che forse di Croazia
> Viene a veder la Veronica nostra,
> Che per l'antica fama non si sazia,
> Ma dice nel pensier, fin che si mostra,
> Signor mio Gesù Christo Dio verace,
> Or fu sì fatta la sembianza vostra?—Paradiso, XXXI.

that it could not be distinguished from the original. It naturally worked frequent miracles and many confraternities of the Sainte Face were organized in its honor. In time of pestilence it was carried in procession and many indulgences were conceded to it, in 1681, by Alexander VII. and, in 1684, by Innocent XI.[1] Yet subsequently the restrictions on copying the Veronica must have been relaxed and a great demand have been created for copies, for early in the sixteenth century the painters of it formed a class by themselves—*pictores Veronicarum*—and not long after we hear of Jean de Dumex as the painter officially commissioned to furnish Christendom with copies.[2] After this the restriction seems to have been again in force until recent years.

Fresh attention was attracted to the Santo Volto by a miracle during the exile of Pius IX. to Gaeta in 1849. It is exhibited from Christmas to Epiphany; the image is very faint and scarce distinguishable behind the glass which covers it, but on this occasion it suddenly for three hours shone forth in an aureole of light, having the death-pallor of a corpse, with sunken eyes and an expression of stern severity. The canons in charge of the solemnity promptly summoned their colleagues, the bells were rung, the people trooped in and were profoundly impressed; an apostolic notary was sent for, who made a formal act of the occurrence. That same evening some veils of white silk on which the Holy Face was represented were applied to it and were immediately sent to France. The devotion of the Catholic world being thus excited afresh for the Veronica a large demand quickly sprang up for copies of it, to which Pius IX. benignantly responded by allowing them to be printed on silk, muslin or linen, authenticated with a seal and certificate, and sold at a price which put them within reach of all but the poorest—eight cents for the smaller size and fourteen cents for the larger.[3]

---

[1] On the destruction of the nunnery in the Revolution the Holy Face was transferred to the cathedral of Laon, where, in 1821, the bishop granted an indulgence of forty days for visiting it, yet it fell into neglect, and only of late years has interest in it been revived by processions.—Janvier, pp. 68–84.

[2] Armellini, Diario di Paride de Grassi, p. 107.—Janvier, p. 56.

[3] Janvier, pp. 52–3, 57. An advertisement of these copies before me reads

"Copie authentique de la Sainte Face de Notre Seigneur, conservée à Rome

Petit format, sur toile, avec le cachet,	40	cent.	}	Franco, avec
Grand format, " " "	70	"	}	l'authentique."

The enthusiasm thus aroused was not allowed to exhaust itself without permanent results. A Carmelite nun of Tours, named Marie de S. Pierre, who died in 1848, had for some ten years been receiving revelations in which the sins committed by a reckless generation had been compared to the blood and sweat from which Veronica had cleansed the Saviour's face, and men were urged to imitate her piety. Thus the little community was ripe for the new access of devotion to the Sudarium, and, in 1851, procured three authentic copies of it. Two of these the nuns gave to Léon Dupont, a rich lawyer from Martinique, who had settled in Tours. He gave one to the Lazarists and hung the other in his reception-room, where he kept a lamp burning before it day and night, and invited all visitors to join him in prayer. The devotion was contagious, and naturally there soon came graces and miracles and cures; even the oil from the lamp was in request to anoint the sick. The fame of the shrine spread far and near, and for twenty-five years a constant stream of pilgrims visited it, with daily recurring prodigies. After his death, in 1876, the room was turned into a chapel; the Archbishop of Tours founded a little community of priests, under the name of "Priests of the Holy Face," to occupy the house and conduct the cult; in 1884 Leo XIII. approved the erection of a confraternity under the same name, which, in 1885, was enlarged to an archconfraternity, with power to aggregate to itself subordinate brotherhoods everywhere except in Rome, and it has already spread throughout France, Belgium, Holland, Germany, England and America. The members wear a cross, a medal or a scapular with the figure of the Veronica, their devotions are directed to prevent or to atone for the offences against the Divine Majesty and the authority of the Church, to which the age is so prone, and to this end they recite daily a Pater, Ave and Gloria. Leo XIII. is not as liberal with the treasure as his predecessor, and thus far has only given them, besides some moderate partials, seven plenaries a year, with one on entrance and death-bed and one yearly for a pilgrimage to the chapel at Tours.[1] Much however is hoped for from the zeal of the new organization, and if it spreads and becomes powerful it will doubtless be more richly endowed hereafter.

[1] Janvier, pp. 129–38.—Beringer, pp. 578–81. The scapular requires no formalities and need not be put on the member by a priest. Its price, as advertised, is twelve francs per hundred, while the figure out of which to make the scapular can be had for three francs per hundred.

CHAPTER XII.

INDULGENCED OBJECTS.

In the last chapter allusion has been made to rosaries and scapulars to which indulgences are attached. At first sight the idea may seem anomalous that by a few words of consecration, or even by a simple sign of the cross, an inanimate object of man's handiwork can be gifted with power to regulate the duration of punishment in purgatory and thus to affect the destiny of an immortal soul, but in all ages and all faiths sacred and goetic magic have been exercised in this manner, and amulets and charms for good or for evil have been among the commonest subjects of popular belief. In the application of this to indulgences it is evident that, when it was once established that they could be attached to a church or an altar, no great stretch of faith was required to believe that they could be similarly applied to a crucifix or a rosary or any other object employed to stimulate and guide devotion. When the admission was once made there could be no limit assigned to its application, save the discretion of those to whom the dispensation of the treasure was confided, while, if the people were eager to win remission of sin in any and every manner, the Church was no less ready to gratify their unquestioning faith.

Yet it was not until the sixteenth century that this method of granting indulgences seems to have been invented. The official *Raccolta*, indeed, informs us that Sixtus V. was the originator of the idea, when, in 1587, while restoring the Lateran basilica, in pulling down some walls a hoard of ancient gold coins was found, bearing on the reverse a cross and on the obverse the heads of emperors from Theodosius the Great to Heraclius, and the pope distributed them after attaching indulgences to them. After this his successors indulgenced medals, chaplets, rosaries, crosses, crucifixes and the like, considering that the use of these sacred objects would stimulate the faithful to faith and to acts of adoration to God and of veneration to the Blessed Virgin and the saints.[1]

[1] Raccolta, p. 389 (Ed. 1855). Beringer accepts this and says that the suc

This is not strictly accurate. It is true that Sixtus distributed to princes, cardinals and other eminent persons the coins found in the Lateran enriched with liberal indulgences; thus a person carrying one of them received a hundred years and quarantines for simply lifting the hat or bending the knee to a sacred image, and a plenary for every time he should confess and take the sacrament, with various other remissions on an equally liberal scale, provided that after his death the medal should pass to a church, which would then enjoy a plenary on the feasts of the Invention and the Exaltation of the Cross.[1] But Sixtus was by no means the originator of the custom. Some fifty years earlier we are told that it was suggested by Paul III., and that Paul IV. (1555–1559) put it in practice, though he was sparing in the distribution of the treasure and only granted to such objects seven years and quarantines.[2] The earliest trace I have met with of such indulgences are those attached to blessed candles, granted by Adrian VI. and confirmed by Clement VII. in the *Bula de la Candela de nuestra Señora del Rosario*, as published, in 1536, by the Commissioner General of the Spanish Cruzada. Every one paying two reales became a member of the Confraternity of Nuestra Señora del Rosario and received a blessed candle; if he had once recited the rosary, by holding this candle in his hands at death he acquired a plenary.[3] These candles had an image of the Virgin on them, and it is related that, in 1541, when Charles V. was besieging Algiers and a dreadful tempest threatened the destruction of his fleet, the Count of Ognata lighted one of these candles in honor of the Virgin, when at once the tempest subsided; the candle burnt without consuming the image; it was preserved and presented to the altar of the Rosary in the convent of Vittoria.[4] When, in 1556,

cessors of Sixtus confined the indulgenced objects to crowned heads and magnates, but the custom gradually developed with the purpose of stimulating the faithful to pious works.—Die Ablässe, p. 309.

[1] Sixti PP. V. Bull. *Laudemus*, 1 Dec. 1587 (Bullar. II. 664).

[2] Jos. Silos Hist. Cleric. Regular. (Amort de Indulg. II. 41).

[3] Perez de Lara, Compendio de las tres Gracias, p. 25. It was an ancient custom for the dying to hold a lighted candle—probably derived from the use of one in extreme unction. See Franz, Die deutschen Sterbebüchlein, Köln, 1890.

[4] Huguet, Vertu Miraculeuse des Lampes et des Cierges allumés en l'honneur de Marie, de Joseph et de Sainte Anne, p. 22 (Paris, 1875). It seems that at

Ignatius Loyola died he held in his hand a blessed candle, which was subsequently enclosed in crystal and was kept in the infirmary of the Jesuit house in Brussels, where it was customarily placed in the hands of the dying.[1] That by the middle of the century the use of such blessed objects had become common is shown by the cautious protest of Azpilcueta, who, while conceding the great power of the pope over indulgences, is not willing to admit that, by holding in the hand some blessed beads or a rosary, a few prayers will release a soul from purgatory, unless indeed it has little purging to endure, and he therefore warns the people to be discreet in the use of such indulgences.[2]

It is impossible thus to define with precision the exact date of the origin of the custom of attaching indulgences to objects by blessing them, but it evidently is not earlier than the sixteenth century ; it was looked upon at first by theologians with distrust, and it did not spread until the seventeenth century was fairly advanced. In fact, as we shall see, these indulgences are mostly of a considerably later date, and when, in 1678, the Congregation of Indulgences declared invalid all those attached to chaplets, rosaries, beads, crosses and images prior to the reformatory legislation of Clement VIII. and Pius V., it shows that the claims industriously put forth by confraternities and religious Orders for indulgences of greater antiquity were regarded as simply fraudulent.[3]

As the custom grew it naturally became popular, for the carrying of a medal or a little image or cross or of a chaplet, which should add enormously to the efficacy of the simplest pious exercises, was an easy method of gaining indulgences. This, of course, led to traffic in such objects and other abuses requiring suppression, while

---

Arras, in the twelfth or thirteenth century, there was a *Confrèrie des Ardents* in custody of the Sainte Chandelle, given by the Virgin, which arrested a pestilence. It continued to work miracles, confirmed after investigation by Sixtus IV. In 1597 Clement VIII. granted a plenary for visiting the chapel of the Confraternity of Nôtre Dame des Ardents in Arras on three feasts of the year.—Ib. pp. 16–20.

[1] Stewart Rose, St. Ignatius Loyola and the Early Jesuits, p. 603.

[2] Azpilcuetæ de Oratione Cap. XIX. n. 164. This work was written in Spanish in 1547 and translated into Latin by the author in 1577. My copy is of the later edition, and to which date the passage belongs I cannot say, but both are prior to Sixtus V.

[3] Decr. Authent. n. 14.

numerous doubtful questions arose which had to be decided, giving occasion for a considerable body of legislation, much of which illustrates sharply the impossibility of escaping incongruity in the attempt to invest material objects with spiritual attributes. For it was distinctly enunciated that the indulgences are attached to the object and not to the prayers that might be said to it or on it. If it is a chaplet or a rosary they are affixed to the beads; if it is a crucifix, to the Christ and not to the cross.[1] When a custom sprang up of using, in place of beads, a metal circle with a flat cross on it and ten knobs by which the record of the prayers could be kept, and when, in 1836, Bishop Bouvier questioned the Holy See whether these could be indulgenced as chaplets or rosaries, the answer was the negative, unless a special faculty should be given for that purpose.[2]

Such being the case there have been necessarily many rules enunciated concerning the materials that can be employed, under penalty of invalidity of the indulgences attached—rules which have varied from time to time and have not been wholly consistent with each other, leading to no little perplexity among the faithful, especially since modern ingenuity has so greatly multiplied the resources of the manufacturer. The chief object kept in view has been to prohibit the employment of perishable materials, and hence images printed on paper or pasteboard have always been excluded, and yet we have seen that engravings of the Via Crucis could be substituted for the blessed crosses. In a decree issued, about 1680, by Innocent XI. the materials specified for these objects are gold, silver or other metals, showing that there was no discrimination between metallic substances,[3] but subsequently all faculties for blessing such objects specified that paintings, painted images and things made of iron, tin, lead or any perishable material were not eligible. Still, in 1820, the Congregation of Indulgences, in resolving doubts on the subject, decreed that chaplets and rosaries made of iron, tin, lead or perishable material could be duly blessed, and, in 1853, the prohibition against iron was formally removed, while tin and lead were still kept under the ban.[4] The latest promulgation of general rules was in 1878, and in these printed or painted images or crosses, crucifixes,

[1] Beringer, Die Ablässe, p. 304.—Decr. Authent. n. 520.
[2] Bouvier, Traité des Indulgences, p. 159.—Beringer, p. 303.
[3] Collect. Bullar. *penes me.*
[4] Decr. Authent. n. 431, 661.

little statuettes or medals of tin, lead or other destructible substance are excluded, but, in 1887, the Congregation approved the use of *carton-madera*, which I presume is some variety of *papier-mâché*.[1] The general term of "perishable material" is not easy to define rigidly. In 1775 it was assumed that metal Christs on crosses of ivory or wood could not be blessed, because the material of the cross is fragile, yet, as we have seen, wood is universally accepted as a material for crosses in the *Via Crucis*, and an ivory Christ has been decided to be available.[2] The whole subject has evidently thus far proved beyond the capacity of the Church to settle in a manner to relieve all doubts.

As indestructibility is only a comparative term when applied to human handiwork, notwithstanding all care exercised to avoid the use of perishable material, it has necessarily been requisite to formulate rules as to damaged, defaced and broken objects, and to define at what point they must be deemed to have forfeited their indulgences, for it disappears when they are so injured as to lose their original character.[3] Ferraris admits the difficulty of satisfactory definition, but assumes that if they can be so repaired as to retain their former semblance the indulgence is preserved.[4] The question is naturally most apt to arise with chaplets and rosaries, of which the cord is liable to break and the beads to be scattered. They can be restrung, and if a few of the beads be lost, these can be replaced, but if a half of them go they cannot be, which would seem reasonable, as otherwise the chaplet or rosary could be divided and filled up into two, and the process be continued indefinitely. Still, if successive breakages occur, the original beads can be gradually replaced until none of the old ones are left, without vitiating the indulgence.[5] As for medals, a certain amount of damage works no forfeiture; if the ring by which one is suspended breaks, this can be replaced, but if the face becomes so rubbed that the image of the saint on it is indistinguishable, it loses its indulgence, for all medals and images must be of regularly canonized saints or of martyrs duly catalogued in the martyrologies.[6]

---

[1] Beringer, pp. 302, 310. [2] Decr. Authent. n. 361.—Bouvier, p. 153.

[3] Gröne, Der Ablass, p. 138.

[4] Ferraris Prompta Biblioth. s. v. *Indulgentia*, Art. I. n. 20.—Raccolta di Indulgenze, p. 25 (Camerino, 1803).

[5] Bouvier, pp. 86–7.—Beringer, p. 304.

[6] Beringer, pp. 304, 310.—Decr. *Utriusque sexus*, 1758 (Collect. Bullar. *penes*

Although the objects thus indulgenced are classed among the *sacramentalia*, and although these indulgences are technically known as "real," the objects readily lose their sacramental character and the indulgences are to a certain extent personal. This has arisen partially from the laudable desire to prevent their being used as articles of traffic, leading to the gradual establishment of rigid rules with regard to ownership and transfer. Originally it would seem that there were no restrictions placed on the free transmission from hand to hand of these objects, but, as their number increased and they commenced to furnish a notable portion of current indulgences, there grew up apparently a conviction that things thus virtually indestructible, if their graces were perpetual, would multiply to an inconvenient extent. At least this would seem to be the explanation of a decree by Alexander VII., February 6, 1657, defining that these objects are good only in the hands of those to whom they are first given, or to those to whom the first owner may give them; if they pass into third hands or are lent they lose the indulgence; if lost they cannot be replaced by others of the same kind, and all concession or privilege of this nature is void.[1] The permission given by Alexander for a second transfer was withdrawn in 1711, when the Congregation of Indulgences decided that only the person receiving such an object from his priest could enjoy the benefit of it; if he gave it away the indulgence was vitiated.[2] This has continued to be the rule, the only relaxation being that a man can have a number blessed for the purpose of distributing them; if he dies without doing so, his heirs inherit the right, and in 1887 the Congregation decided that an object can in this manner pass through several hands without losing its privileges.[3] So strictly is the prohibition of lending defined that if a man lends a blessed rosary to another to gain its indulgence, not only does the borrower not gain it, but the rosary becomes valueless to the owner, though he can lend it without forfeiture if it is merely to be used for prayer. It is thus simply a matter of intention on the part of the lender; whether the intention of the borrower has any

me). According to this latter nothing lost from such objects can be replaced without forfeiting the indulgence.

[1] Alex. PP. VII. Decr. *Sanctissimus*, 6 Feb. 1657.

[2] Decr. Authent. n. 27.

[3] Ferraris, s. v. *Indulgentia*, Art. I. n. 20.—Decr. Authent. n. 661.—Beringer, pp. 305–6.

influence is a question which seems not yet to have been raised. Hiring and bequeathing are equally fatal.[1] With regard to the use of these objects, the instructions are that they are to be carried on the person or to be kept in some fitting place in the house or apartment; so that the prayers enjoined can be recited before them.[2]

The question of traffic in these objects is a more difficult one. Alexander VII., in his decree of 1657, did not forbid it. The principal trade in them seems to have consisted in crosses, medals, and rosaries from the Holy Land, which was chiefly in the hands of the Observantine Franciscans, and this was prohibited, in 1721, by the Congregation of Indulgences, which denounced it as causing scandal to the faithful; of course, the indulgences were lost by a strict construction of the rule respecting transfer from hand to hand. This bore hardly upon a pilgrim who had returned to Augsburg with a number of these objects and found his market closed, and in 1722 he applied to the congregation for a special faculty enabling him to reimburse himself, which was refused.[3] This was construed as applying to all indulgenced objects, the sale of which forfeits the graces, but still there was the convenient fiction of "alms" through which, by a tacit understanding, although no price might be named, some payment would be expected. Even this has recently been forbidden, when the Congregation, after considerable debate, in 1887, decided that the indulgence is forfeited if anything, either as price or in exchange or as gift is demanded or received.[4] The question is a difficult one, especially as these objects are blessed and circulated in great quantities. They are not like other matters, such as a prayer or a visit to a church, which is a simple action; they are the product of human labor, which must in some way be paid for, both in the manufacture and transportation, and if the decrees are rigidly observed their dissemination must be much impeded. In 1837 the Congregation decided, in answer to the Bishop of Bruges, that a man who should buy a number of rosaries, and have them blessed, could not sell them at cost, simply to reimburse himself, but in spite of this Bishop Bouvier argues that this can be done, for he is to be regarded merely as the agent of those who purchase of him, though if a mer-

[1] Decr. Authent. n. 44, 47, 503, 661.
[2] Raccolta, p. 391 (Ed. 1855).—Decr. Authent. n. 661.
[3] Decr. Authent. n. 44, 47.—Beringer, p. 319.
[4] Decr. Authent. n. 661.—Beringer, p. 307.

chant has such articles indulgenced and then offers them at no increase of price he is considered to be doing it in order to render them more salable, and as it becomes a matter of trade the indulgence is lost.[1] Even this concession is still further limited, nominally at least, by modern strictness, for the most that Beringer will admit is that a number of people may agree to procure such objects and commission some one to purchase them and have them blessed, when they can reimburse him the cost.[2] Doubtless in some such way the material difficulties can be overcome, and the priest who blesses may be regarded as the agent of those who obtain the objects. He who is accustomed to receive "alms" for the sacrifice of the altar can hardly be expected to respect the scruple that would prevent him from recouping the cost of a rosary or of a cross to which his blessing has attached an indulgence. That a traffic in such articles is kept up is shown by the frauds which are still practised and which would be abandoned if they were not profitable—rosaries with cards stating that the beads are olive seeds from the genuine tree of Gethsemane, and that each one carries an indulgence of a thousand days, and the like.[3]

Indulgenced objects are of two classes—those which derive their virtue from the papal benediction and those which are enriched by touching other holy things. The latter is the simpler class and can be more conveniently considered first. It is a belief of old standing that the virtues of a relic can be communicated to an object by touching it, and if these are indulgences they are thereby conferred upon it. In the trial of Pierre de Bonneville, by the Inquisition of Toledo in 1564, he admitted that when the image of Nuestra Señora del Sagrario was carried around the cathedral and the people crowded about it to touch it with their beads and rosaries, he had said that the latter were not thereby blessed.[4] So, in 1690, in Lima, an impostor named Angela Carranza, who long deceived prelates and people, professed to have carried beads to heaven and had them blessed by God. Some of these beads were treasured in the church of San Marcelo, so that rosaries could be touched with them and car-

[1] Bouvier, Traité des Indulgences, p. 154.
[2] Beringer, pp. 307–8.
[3] Beringer, p. 319.
[4] MSS. Königl. Biblioth. Univ. Halle, Yc. 20, Tom. V.

ried to the dying, whose salvation was thus assured.[1] Thus the Observantine Franciscans, to whom was confided the guardianship of the Holy Places, found their account in furnishing rosaries, chaplets and crosses which had been touched to these sacred spots and were held to carry the indulgences bestowed on pilgrimage to them. At first, indeed, this seems not to have been thought of, for, in 1621, Paul V., at the instance of Pablo de Madrid, Observantine Commissioner of the Holy Land, granted certain indulgences to these objects, but as he refused permission to print the concession, their exact nature is not known.[2] As we have seen (p. 459) the Holy Land indulgences were liberal in both plenaries and partials, and the friars were not content with the less lavish papal grants. In 1688 Innocent XI. bestowed on these objects privileges very similar to those attached to the papal blessing,[3] but this did not satisfy them. I have before me a broadside, posterior to the grant of Innocent, in which these objects are set forth as attractively as possible, and though the sale of them is admitted to forfeit the indulgences, it is evident that the business could only have been carried on for profit. It is sufficient here to mention the first item of the summary which promises all the pardons of the Holy Places to any one carrying one of these objects on his person, for the simple recital of a Pater and an Ave, as though he had personally visited the spots. This is asserted to be in virtue of bulls of Paul V., Urban VIII., Innocent X. and Alexander VII., confirmed by Clement IX. and Clement X., the originals of which are said to be preserved in the convent of Ara Cœli. It was difficult to suppress these claims, and,

---

[1] Documentos Literarios del Perú, T. VII. pp. 287 sqq.

At the exposition of the Holy Coat of Trèves, from Aug. 20th to Oct. 4th, 1891, it was estimated that 1,925,130 pilgrims gained the plenary that was offered for the recital of five Paters and Aves before the relic. The sale of chaplets, crosses etc. was enormous, one Cologne firm being reported as selling over $50,000 worth of these articles and the agency of one Paris house over $35,000. Presumably these were unconsecrated and were purchased for the purpose of touching them to the Holy Coat and thus obtaining its virtues. It is said that not content with this, some of the pilgrims, whose zeal outran their scruples, used rosaries of which the crucifixes were armed at the back with hooks, for the purpose of detaching particles of the precious garment. When this was discovered the guards were doubled and the pious thieves anathematized.

[2] Amort de Indulg. I. 219.

[3] Ferraris, s. v. *Indulgentia* Art. v. n. 63.

in 1721, the Congregation of Indulgences was obliged to pronounce fraudulent a similar summary printed in Augsburg in 1720.[1] This was finally accomplished, however, and it is now accepted that these objects which have touched the Holy Places or relics of Jerusalem have virtually the same indulgences as those blessed by the pope, and described hereafter.[2]

The Chain of St. Peter is a comparatively recent development of the same belief worth passing notice, if only because it is an exception to the rule prohibiting the sale of such objects. The chains preserved for the veneration of the faithful in the church of S. Peter *ad vincula*, according to tradition, are composed of the chain which bound him when thrown in prison by Herod (Acts XII.) and those which he wore in the Mamertine prison prior to his martyrdom, the two having miraculously united themselves when brought together. The veneration for them is of ancient date, and links from them or filings enclosed in a reliquary were in early times marks of especial favor from popes to magnates whom they desired to propitiate.[3] In the winter of 1863–4 the revolutionists offered for sale in Rome pretty steel watch-chains with a ball at the end; they were cheap, they caught the popular fancy and were largely worn, till it was whispered that the chain signified the slavery of Rome and Venice and the ball represented an Orsini bomb. Then the faithful threw them aside with horror, and the idea was suggested of manifesting devotion to the papacy by wearing watch-chains in fac-simile of the chains of St. Peter. Pius IX. approved the suggestion and offered every facility for its execution, not only by allowing them to be sanctified by touching the originals, but by giving the wearers a special benediction. Miracles soon manifested that these trinkets carried the blessing of heaven, and the fashion spread throughout Europe. In 1866 a confraternity was organized to which Pius granted indulgences; this led to an increased demand for the chains, and by May 1st, 1868, the accounts of the brotherhood showed a sale of 22,434, for they were permitted to be an article of traffic, at a franc and a half each, the proceeds being devoted to a structure in St. Peter *ad*

[1] Decr. Authent. n. 44.

[2] Raccolta, p. 397 (Ed. 1855); pp. 448–50 (Ed. 1886).

[3] S. Jo. Chrysost. In Epist. ad Ephes. Cap. IV. Homil. viii.—S. August. Serm. 29 de Sanctis.—S. Gregor. PP. I. Lib. XII. Epist. 26.—Baron. Annal. ann. 796.

vincula and the surplus to Peter's pence. Each chain is accompanied with a certificate from the Abbot of St. Peter's that it has touched the relic, and this certificate serves as an enrolment in the confraternity. The indulgences acquired by wearing the chain are moderate—a plenary on entrance and at death and three during the year, besides some partials.[1] The fashion has probably proved ephemeral, as I find no reference to it in recent works, but it is worth recording as a combination of piety, politics and profit more befitting the thirteenth century than the nineteenth.

Of far greater practical importance is the papal or apostolic blessing, for this covers a multitude of objects and is widely disseminated everywhere. The faculty to administer it is commonly granted to all priests authorized to hear confessions who ask for it; it can either be obtained directly from the Holy See, in which case there is division of opinion as to whether it requires episcopal confirmation, or from the bishop whose faculties authorize him to subdelegate the power, and the extent to which it is expected to be used is seen in the exhortation to bishops not to grant it indiscriminately to all priests and confessors.[2] Sometimes these faculties specify the number of objects that can be blessed, but ordinarily the limit is only as to time, after the expiration of which a renewal is required. When the faculty specifies that it is to be done in private, the power cannot be exercised publicly. The ceremony is a very simple one. The objects can be blessed in block, and it is only necessary to make the sign of the cross over them, without pronouncing any formula of benediction or sprinkling with holy water, for the intention suffices, but it is advised that when it is performed in public it is well that there should be a certain solemnity observed and that the holy water should not be omitted.[3]

The indulgences affixed to the medals, images, crosses, chaplets,

---

[1] Lafond, Histoire des Chaînes de Saint Pierre et de la Confrèrie qui porte ce nom. Paris, 1868.

[2] Decr. Authent. n. 361, 591.—Bouvier, pp. 53–55.—Beringer, pp. 310, 313–4. The Superior of the Congregation of Missions has also a faculty to subdelegate this authority without limit.—Decr. Authent. n. 501.

[3] Decr. Authent. n. 547, 567, 689, 758.—Beringer, p. 300.

The rosary and the chaplet of the Seven Sorrows are, however, exceptions, as a formula of benediction is required for them.—Beringer, *loc. cit.*

and rosaries thus blessed seem to have been first regulated by Clement X. in 1667. Since then some changes have been made from time to time, granting slight increases, not important enough to deserve detailed mention. In the Appendix will be found a fac-simile of a summary issued in 1692, which will indicate the methods adopted to render these articles attractive to the public and the popular teaching as to the effectiveness of a plenary indulgence in eliminating purgatory, teaching in which the doubts expressed by theologians as to the certainty of its operation find no place. It will be seen that the pardons are acquired by the possessor of one of these objects on the easy terms of attending mass or of reciting weekly a chaplet of the Virgin, or a part of the rosary, or the seven penitential psalms, or some other religious exercises, or by helping the "poor;" a single one of these good works suffices, and if forgotten it can be made up at another time. Also all priests are instructed to read the summary to the people prior to the feasts on which the plenaries are obtainable and to urge their acquiring this treasure in order that they may pass more expeditiously to heaven or liberate souls suffering in purgatory. The modern formulas are substantially the same except that visiting prisons and hospitals and teaching Christian doctrine are included among the good works. For these there are plenaries, under the customary conditions, on twenty-six feasts in the year, besides numerous partials, of which I need only mention two hundred days for the good work of helping a sick patient in a hospital or prison, and a hundred days for each time the penitent searches his conscience and repents with a resolve of amendment and the recital of three Paters and Aves, for, as usual, these contrast suggestively with the seven years and quarantines for reciting a chaplet on other feast-days, and five years and quarantines for doing it on Sundays. It is specially provided moreover that other indulgences offered for these pious works are in no way interfered with, but that these are in addition.[1]

On the canonization of new saints it is customary to popularize their cult by the issue of numberless objects of this kind specially indulgenced for them by adding the new saint's days to the feasts on which plenaries are obtainable and offering partials for certain devotional exercises in their honor. Thus in 1767, on the canonization of the Franciscan saint S. Giuseppe da Cupertino, Clement XIII.

[1] Decr. Authent, n. 661.—Raccolta, p. 390 (Ed. 1855).—Beringer, pp. 310-13.

Dell' effetto dell' Indulgenza Plenaria, & in quanta ſtima deuono tenerſi le Medaglie, ò Corone, ò Croceſiſſi benedetti dal Sommo Pontefice, e quello ſi richiede per acquiſtar l' Indulgenza, che conforme la formula acquiſtano quelli, che hanno dette Medaglie.

L'Effetto dell' Indulgenza Plenaria è il rimettere tutta la pena, che l' Anima del Chriſtiano fedele doppo la morte douerìa patire in Purgatorio, di modo che ſe doppo hauer' acquiſtato l' Indulgenza Plenaria moriſſe ſenza hauer cõmeſſo altro peccato, l' Anima ſua ſe ne paſſerebbe al Cielo ſenza Purgatorio.

L' effetto parimente dell' Indulgenza Plenaria quando ſi concede dal Sommo Pontefice che poſſa applicarſi per l' Anime del Purgatorio, opera, che acquiſtandola vn fedele per vn' Anima particulare, quell' Anima venga per modo di ſuffragio (piacendo così alla miſericordia di Dio) liberata dalle pene del Purgatorio, e vada à godere in Paradiſo Dio.

Dall' effetto dell' Indulgenza Plenaria, ſi raccoglie in quanta ſtima deuono tenerſi le Medaglie, Corone, ò Croci, ò Croceſiſſi benedetti dal Sommo Pontefice, potendoſi dalli fedeli, che haueranno vna di dette Medaglie, ò Corone &c. acquiſtare detta Indulgenza Plenaria. Primo, in Articolo di morte con dire Giesù con la bocca, e non potẽdo, col cuore. Secondo, in ventidue Feſte dell'Anno, cioè nella Feſta della Natiuità di N. Sig. Epifania, Aſcenſione, Pentecoſte, Feſta della Santiſſima Trinità, e Corpus Dñi, Feſta della Purificatione, Annunciatione; Aſſuntione, Natiuità della Beatiſſima Vergine, Natiuità di S. Gio: Battiſta, Feſta de' SS. Apoſtoli Pietro, e Paolo, Andrea, Giacomo, Giouanni, Tomaſo, Filippo e Giacomo, Bartolomeo, Matteo, Simone e Giuda, Mattia, & Ogni Santi, & in ciaſcheduna di queſte feſte acquiſterà, ò per ſe, ò per l' Anime del Purgatorio l' iſteſſa Indulgenza Plenaria; ſi che potrà liberare tante Anime dal Purgatorio, quante ſono le ſopradette Feſte, il che è di ſommo ſollieuo a' Pouerelli, che doppo la morte nõ hanno che laſciare per Suffragio dell' Anime loro, potendo cõ l' acquiſtar queſt' Indulgenza liberarſi dalle pene del Purgatorio, e liberare anco l' Anime de' ſuoi Parenti con applicare l' iſteſſa Indulgenza.

Si ricercano però trè conditioni per acquiſtare queſt' Indulgenze.

La Prima, è neceſſario, che chi haurà detta Medaglia, ò Corona &c. reciti ogni ſettimana la Corona di N. Sig. ò della Beatiſſima Vergine, ò vna parte di Roſario, ò l' Officio Diuino, ò della Madonna, ò de' Morti, ò i ſette Salmi Penitentiali, ò Graduali, ouero ſouuenga i Poueri, ò interuenga alla Meſſa, ò la dica eſſendo Sacerdote &c. e baſtarà, che vna ſola opera di queſte ſi faccia vna volta la ſettimana almeno, e tralaſciandoſi, ò per impedimento, ò per ſcordanza, ò per negligenza, ſi potrà ſempre ripigliare.

Seconda, che volendo acquiſtare detta Indulgenza Plenaria, ò per ſe, ò per l' Anime del Purgatorio, ò in vn, ò in più, ò in tutte le ſopradette Feſte, douerà in tal giorno confeſſarſi, e comunicarſi.

Terza, douerà pregare per l' eſaltatione di Santa Madre Chieſa, per l' eſtirpatione dell' hereſie, e concordia de' Prencipi Chriſtiani &c. e per non confonderſi baſtarà pregare Iddio ſecondo la mente del Sommo Pontefice, che hà conceſſo l' Indulgenza: quali trè conditioni ſi ricercano per lo più in guadagnare tutte l' altre Indulgenze Plenarie, che ſi concedono da' Sommi Pontefici.

Che però li Parrochi, e quelli, che hanno cura dell' Anime douerianno prima di dette Feſte leggere queſt' iſteſſo al Popolo, acciòche non perdeſſero tanto Teſoro, e per ſe ſteſſi, e per quelle poucre Anime, che ſtanno penando nel Purgatorio, e cercare, che ogni fedele ſi prouedeſſe di tanto Teſoro, acciòche più ſpediti doppo la morte ſe ne poteſſero paſſare al Cielo.

ROMA, & In Forlì per Gioſeffo Selua 1692. *Con Licenza de' Superiori.*

authorized all the general officials of the Order to bless with indulgences a thousand medals or chaplets or crosses; every provincial received a faculty for five hundred, every ex-provincial for three hundred, and every priest for two hundred.[1] As the organizations specially interested in the new saints would naturally make every effort to stimulate the demand thus provided for, it will readily be seen how efficient a means this offers of introducing to popular favor the new member of the celestial hierarchy and what countless numbers of these objects must thus be circulated.

In addition to the articles thus enriched with the general papal or apostolic indulgences there are numerous special ones, each with its own peculiar graces and requiring its own formulas of devotion to win them. Some of these are fairly permanent; others grow obsolete and are forgotten as new fashions arise, which are supplied by new devices, and it is worthy of remark how greatly these have multiplied during the present century, whether as an evidence of an increased spiritual craving or from a sense that growing popular indifference requires stimulation with novelties.

Thus in the seventeenth century we hear a good deal of the medal and chaplet of the Five Saints—St. Isidor, St. Ignatius Loyola, St. Francis Xavier, St. Filippo Neri and Santa Teresa, all canonized by Gregory XV. At the jubilee of 1625 these were much in evidence. On one occasion 80,000 medals were distributed to pilgrims, and on another 100,000. Besides these the Duchess of Fiano gave a chaplet and a medal to every pilgrim lodged in the buildings of the Confraternity of the Trinità, and the number thus circulated amounted to 564,237. One special grace attached to these medals was that they rendered an altar privileged to any priest possessing one.[2] Yet this medal, once so popular, seems to be no longer heard of, and is not alluded to in any of the recent manuals. The crosses and medals made by the Benedictines of Monserrat seem likewise to be virtually forgotten to-day, although at one time they were much in demand,

---

[1] Ferraris, s. v. *Indulgentia*, Art. VI. n. 23.—Decr. Authent. n. 308.—I happen to have summaries of the indulgences of these objects, issued in 1669, on the occasion of the canonization of San Pedro de Alcántara and Maria Maddalena de' Pazzi, and in 1671, on that of Caietano, Francisco Borgia, Santa Rosa del Perú, etc.

[2] Ricci, de' Giubilei Universali, pp. 225, 242.—Bianchi, Foriero dell' Anno Santo, p. 356.—Summa Diana s. v. *Indulgentiæ requisita*, n. 12.

and were enriched by Urban VIII., in 1625, with twenty-seven several indulgences, many of them most liberal, and confirmed by successive popes up to Innocent. XII. One distinguishing privilege was that the indulgences did not expire at the death of the owner of the object, but passed unimpaired to the new possessor.[1] Probably the use of these medals has been circumscribed and localized by the success of the Benedictine medal, which has the advantage of being a talisman as well as a vehicle for indulgences. It seems that, in 1647, some witches on trial in Bavaria admitted that their sorceries were powerless where there was a cross, and indicated the Abbey of Metten as a spot peculiarly exempt. This led to an investigation of the abbey, where there were found great crosses painted on the walls and adorned with mysterious letters which could not be explained until the key was discovered in a MS. of 1415. This led to the striking of medals, bearing on the obverse St. Benedict with a cross in one hand and a book in the other, and the legend *Crux S. P. Benedicti*, while the reverse was quartered with a cross; in the four quarters of the field were the letters C. S. P. B. (*Crux Sancti Pater Benedicti*), on the upright of the cross C. S. S. M. L. (*Crux sacra sit mihi lux*), on the horizontal bar N. D. S. M. D. (*Non draco sit mihi dux*), while around the rim, with the sacred I. H. S. at the top were V. R. S. N. S. M. V. —S. M. Q. L. I. V. B. (*Vade retro Satana, Nunquam suade mihi vana. —Sunt mala quæ libas, Ipse venena bibas*). The use of these medals as talismans spread rapidly, and innumerable are the miracles recounted of their powers, both spiritual and temporal, down to the present day. As a rule, we are told, it suffices to wear one devoutly, but, if some special favor is desired, it is advisable on a Tuesday to say five Glorias, three Aves and then three more Glorias to secure the protection of St. Benedict. In 1742 Benedict XIV. set the stamp of papal approbation on this by admitting these medals to the benefit of papal indulgences. At first the privilege of blessing them was conferred exclusively on the Benedictines of Bohemia, Moravia and Silesia, but other communities were gradually admitted, from Hungary to Portugal; then power was granted to delegate faculties—at first only to Benedictine priests, but, in 1856, this was extended so as to admit all priests. Many medals, it is said, have the mysterious letters incorrectly, and in this case the indulgence is doubtful,

[1] Amort de Indulg. I. 214–16.

for Benedict XIV. described the inscriptions correctly, and speaks of them as having been designated by God himself.[1] In 1880, in honor of the fourteenth centenary of the birth of St. Benedict, the Abbot of Monte Cassino had commemoration medals struck with some additional distinguishing marks, and for these eight more annual plenaries are conceded; all abbots have power to authorize priests of the Order to bless them, and where there are no Benedictines other priests can obtain the faculty from the Abbot of Monte Cassino.[2]

Of less value are the medals of Nôtre Dame de Moutuset, bearing an image of the Virgin, which are blessed by the rector of the confraternity of the same name, under a concession from Pius VII. in 1819, for they only confer an indulgence of three hundred days for kissing the image while performing some pious work.[3] Pius gave rise to some discussion by granting, in 1804, and confirming, in 1805, some unusual indulgences to certain crucifixes, including two plenaries a month, besides the Stations of Rome for saying seven Paters and Aves, and the indulgences of the Via Crucis for fourteen Paters and Aves. The most peculiar feature of this was that the indulgences, except the latter, passed with the crucifix to anyone to whom the owner might lend, give, or bequeath it. In 1819 the attention of the Congregation of Indulgences was called to these crucifixes, when Pius abrogated the indulgences for the future, but permitted those who possessed them to enjoy their privileges personally during life. Yet they continued in circulation, with the added statement on the accompanying cards, that the indulgences had been confirmed in 1852 by Pius IX., all of which the Congregation in 1856 declared to be apocryphal and the indulgences worthless.[4]

More successful has been the miraculous medal of the Immaculate Conception, which took its origin in 1830 through the visions of a Sister of Charity of Paris, in which the Virgin ordered a medal struck, having on the obverse the sacred Hearts of Jesus and Mary, with the letter M., and on the reverse the prayer, "O Mary, immaculately conceived, pray for us whose refuge is in thee!" Her spiritual director treated it as an illusion, but on a repetition of the visions he

---

[1] Decr. Authent. n. 112, 113, 228, 229, 235, 236, 297, 300, 364, 370.—Beringer, pp. 351–3.

[2] Beringer, pp. 353–4.

[3] Decr. Authent. n. 426.

[4] Ibid. n. 430, 704.

communicated them to the Archbishop of Paris, who approved of the idea, and the medals were struck. Distributed by the Sisters of Charity, they speedily proved to be talismans, working miraculous cures, conversions, preservation of life in battle, etc. The indulgences conferred on them are moderate—only some twelve or fifteen plenaries per annum, but their miraculous powers obtained for them an immense success, and their use has spread everywhere, from America to China, and even in Tunis we are told the Arabs are eager to get them and wear them. Marshal Bugeaud carried one on his breast, and they are universally suspended around the necks of children. They were adopted by the Confraternity of the Sacred Heart of Mary (p. 493), and Père Huguet, writing in 1874, assures us that there were then not less than thirty millions of them in use.[1]

There is a trifling indulgence for little images of St. Peter, which are an exception to the general rule in that they require to be blessed by the pope himself. In 1857 Pius IX. granted fifty days for kissing the feet of the bronze statue of St. Peter in the Vatican basilica, and in 1877 he extended this to small images of it, good both for the possessors and their families. Limited as is the indulgence, being *toties quoties*, and the work to acquire it infinitesimal, it could be multiplied indefinitely, until, in 1880, Leo XIII. limited it to one in each day.[2] Another somewhat exceptional object is the *toties quoties* crucifix to be used by priests at the death-bed of their penitents, which can be blessed either by the pope himself or those to whom he delegates the power. Such a crucifix confers a plenary on the dying man who kisses it, and they are given to Sisters of Charity in hospitals, where they can administer it if no other religious aid is at hand. If a priest has once thus used it himself it loses the indulgence if he lends it to another to be employed for the same purpose.

[1] Huguet, Vertu miraculeuse de la Médaille de la très-sainte Vierge. Paris, 1874.

There is also a medal of St. Joseph, which seems to be simply an amulet, as there are no indulgences enumerated as attached to it. It protects those who carry it devoutly against all the accidents to which they are exposed from the malice of demons, the ill-will of men and imprudence of friends.—Huguet, Vertu Miraculeuse de la Médaille de Saint Joseph, Saint-Dizier, 1876.

Père Huguet is, or was, a Marist priest and author of many devotional works, which have been translated into most of the European languages, and have enjoyed an immense circulation.

[2] Raccolta, pp. 385–6.

A decree of Benedict XIV., in 1744, allows the possessor to have the benefit of it on his own death-bed.[1]

The more important section of these blessed objects consists of rosaries and chaplets or crowns. By a somewhat doubtful tradition the use of beads, as a device for keeping tally of prayers endlessly repeated, is attributed to Peter the Hermit, who is said to have strung wooden beads in order to enable his ignorant crusaders to recite a certain number of Paters and Aves, but in those days short and easy prayers were not in fashion as penance, and the earnest men who in the preceding centuries reiterated interminable psalters must have had some assistance of the kind which was so directly derived from the immemorial *abacus*. Be this as it may, the use of beads became universal, and in the form of the rosary, as we have seen, they occupy perhaps the most prominent place among the accessories of devotion, growing in importance as the cult of the Virgin has developed. When duly blessed the rosary carries abundant indulgences to those not members of the confraternity specially instituted for its use, but these have already been sufficiently alluded to (p. 488) and need not be repeated here.

Next to the rosary comes the crown or chaplet, a string of beads consisting of five or six decades, which is largely specialized in many forms of religious exercise, each stimulated and rewarded by its peculiar indulgences. To obtain them the beads must be duly blessed, for the indulgence is attached to the beads and not to the prayers. The chaplet most ordinarily in use is that of five decades, commonly known as the Apostolic chaplet, having the papal blessing, on which one recitation a week obtains the papal indulgences enumerated above.[2] Of other chaplets the most noteworthy is that which passes under the name of St. Birgitta, who is considered to have invented it in the fourteenth century to symbolize the seven sorrows of the Virgin and her sixty-three years of life. It consists of six decades, each containing one Pater, ten Aves and a creed, and at the end one Pater and three Aves. The chaplets must be blessed by priests of the Order of St. Birgitta, or, since that is now extinct, by the Regular Canons of the Saviour in St. Peter's *ad vincula*, whose General Abbot can deputize the faculty to all priests of the

[1] Beringer, pp. 315–17.—Decr. Authent. n. 129.

[2] Bouvier, p. 149.

Order, and to other priests to the extent of three hundred chaplets. Other chaplets and rosaries are frequently "birgittized," as it is called, that is, have the Birgittine indulgences cumulated on them, power to do which must be specially mentioned in the faculties conferred by the pope. As other chaplets consist only of five decades, this has led to much confusion and doubt whether the Birgittine chaplet has five or six, and whether the Birgittine indulgences are obtainable by the recitation of a chaplet of five decades; contradictory decisions on these points have been rendered by the Congregation of Indulgences, and it was not until 1886 that the validity of the shorter recitation was established. An indulgence was claimed to have been granted by Alexander VI. to this chaplet, but this has been pronounced apocryphal, and the earliest that is recognized is a concession of some partials by Leo X., in 1515. There seem to have been none of importance until, in 1714, Clement XI. granted a plenary for the daily recital of five decades during the year. Benedict XIV. was more liberal, and, in 1743, conceded a plenary at death for habitual recital of a chaplet per week, and another every month for a daily recital; also one on the feast of St. Birgitta (October 8) for the weekly recital of five decades. There it rests for the present, and, like most of the older devotions, it is inferior to the more modern in the rewards promised for the labor required, although, on the other hand, no meditation on the mysteries of Christ is required.[1]

A much easier performance is that of the Chaplet of the Lord Jesus Christ, invented, it is said, about 1516, by the Blessed Michele da Firenze, a Camaldulensian monk. This consists merely of thirty-three Paters, in honor of the years of Christ, five Aves for the five wounds and a creed in honor of the Apostles. It must be recited on a chaplet blessed by the Camaldulensians or by a priest having papal faculties. It claims indulgences from Leo X., Gregory XIII. and Sixtus V., though it may be doubted whether their confirmation by Clement X., in 1674, was not the first authentic grant. They are large for so simple an act of devotion—two hundred years for each recitation accompanied by confession or intention to confess, and one hundred and fifty without such intention, a yearly plenary for

[1] Raccolta, pp. 190–2.—Decr. Authent. n. 33, 121, 505, 510, 512, 540, 551.—Decret. de Libb. Prohib. § III. n. 10.—Beringer, pp. 330–33.

four recitations a week, a monthly plenary for daily recitation, and a plenary on each Friday in March on which recitation is made, besides one at death if during sickness it has been recited with that intention.[1] The Servites not only have a scapular (p. 496), but a Chaplet of the Seven Sorrows of the Virgin, the formulation of which is attributed to the founders of the Order in the thirteenth century. It consists of seven parts, each of one Pater and seven Aves, and concludes with three additional Aves in honor of the tears of the Virgin. It should commence with an elaborate act of contrition, and each part has its appropriate meditation on its special sorrow. Its earliest indulgences are apparently those granted by Benedict XIII. in 1724, increased by Clement XII. in 1734, and by Pius IX. in 1877. The partials are liberal, but the plenaries comparatively scanty in view of the labor involved—one a year for habitual recital four times a week, and monthly for daily recital. It was simplified however, in 1886, by Leo XIII., who withdrew for the latter and for most of the partials the condition of reading or meditating on the formulas. The chaplets can only be blessed by the Servite superiors or by members of the Order deputized by them.[2]

The Chaplet of the Blessed Jeanne de Valois was enriched, in 1756, by Benedict XIV. with a monthly plenary for daily recitation,[3] but I presume that it has become obsolete, as it is not referred to in recent manuals. The Chaplet of the Five Wounds is a Passionist devotion, consisting of five parts, each of five Glorias and one Ave. Its earliest indulgences were granted by Leo XII. in 1823, and were increased by Pius IX. in 1851. There are thirteen plenaries a year for ten recitations a month, and another one for daily recitation in Passion week. The chaplets must be blessed by the Passionist superior or by delegation from him.[4] The Chaplet of the Precious Blood originally consisted of seven mysteries, the first six of five Paters and a Gloria, the seventh of three Paters and a Gloria, representing Christ's thirty-three years, each mystery having an appropriate meditation. For the daily recitation of this, in 1815, Pius VII. granted seven years and quarantines a day and a monthly plenary, but in 1843, at the request of the Congregation of the

---

[1] Raccolta, pp. 46–8.—Decr. Authent. n. 450.—Beringer, p. 351.

[2] Raccolta, pp. 197–203.

[3] Decr. Authent. n. 227.

[4] Decr. Authent. n. 443, 650.—Raccolta, pp. 137–9.

Precious Blood, Gregory XVI. reduced the whole to thirty-three Paters and omitted the meditations for those incapable of meditating.[1] The Chaplet of the Sacred Heart of Mary is in five parts, each consisting of a Pater and seven Aves, with an appropriate meditation. For this, in 1854, Pius IX. granted three hundred days for each recital and a monthly plenary for daily recitals.[2]

Somewhat different from these is the Angelic Chaplet of St. Michael. Tradition relates that the angel appeared to a pious woman and revealed that a certain formula of prayer was especially agreeable to him and to the other angels. It is somewhat formidable, consisting of nine salutations, one for each choir of the angelic host, in each of which are a Pater, three Aves, a formula of praise, an antiphon and a prayer. It was preserved in the Carmelite nunnery of Forcassi, and, in 1851, the nuns petitioned Pius IX. for indulgences for its chaplet. The good pope, who seems never to have refused such a demand upon the treasure, granted a hundred days for every day on which the chaplet is worn or the medal of angels attached to it is kissed, seven years and quarantines for each recital, and for daily recital a plenary every month and on four feast-days in the year. In 1877 he authorized all priests holding faculties for blessing objects to include these chaplets.[3] The Rosary of the Holy Cross is also peculiar. The Augustinian canons of the Holy Cross —an Order which seems confined to the Netherlands—claim to have received from Leo X., by a brief of August 20, 1516, an indulgence for rosaries blessed by their superior of five hundred days for every Pater or Ave recited on them. In 1845 Gregory XVI., and, in 1848, Pius IX. gave to the General Master of the Order power to delegate to his canons the blessing of these rosaries. So simple a devotion so richly repaid naturally spread and excited many doubts arising from the magnitude and indiscreetness of the indulgence, leading to innumerable inquiries addressed to the Congregation of Indulgences. This body, in 1884, after due consideration pronounced it valid, but restricted the blessing strictly to the canons. From a financial point of view this decision would seem extremely favorable to the Order, for the use of these rosaries is extending

[1] Decr. Authent. n. 578.—Raccolta, pp. 151–7.
[2] Decr. Authent. n. 685.—Raccolta, pp. 297–300.
[3] Decr. Authent. n. 647.—Raccolta, pp. 340–5.

rapidly, and there is a lively traffic in them, in spite of the rule invalidating an indulgence in case of sale or transfer.[1]

A single rosary or chaplet can be blessed so as to carry all the different indulgences bestowed on the various kinds, but to win them the possessor must perform the special exercises prescribed for each.[2] This would seem self-evident, but a more doubtful question arises whether, when a man has two or more medals or crosses carrying an indulgence for a certain number of Paters or Aves, he can by a single recitation obtain the cumulated pardon. Among the older writers there was a division of opinion as to this, some holding the strictly logical view that each object conferred its own indulgence, while others argued that the reward of the pious work could not be thus multiplied. The latter opinion would seem to be the prevailing one at present.[3]

Liberal as are the graces conferred on indulgenced objects, a comparison with the still more profuse grants to the confraternities will indicate the policy of the Church in stimulating the growth of the latter.

---

[1] Raccolta, pp. 192–3.—Beringer, pp. 334–6.

[2] Decr. Authent. n. 431.—Beringer, pp. 301, 333.

[3] Ludov. Leti Tract. de Indulg. Sect. 7.—Polacchi Comment. in Bull. Urbani VIII. pp. 284–5.—Salmanticens. Theol. Moral. Tract. VI. Append. Cap. ii. n. 73.—Raccolta di Indulgenze p. 39 (Camerino, 1803).—Beringer, p. 310.

CHAPTER XIII.

MODERN EXPANSION.

It might seem as though the lavish distribution of the treasure summarized in the last few chapters had well-nigh exhausted all the methods of bringing within reach of the faithful an assured escape from purgatory. The wholesome injunction as to moderation prescribed by the council of Trent has, however, been so contemptuously disregarded that there are still some indulgences to be mentioned which can be obtained without entrance to a brotherhood or possession of an indulgenced object or visiting a church. In the virtual abandonment of the penitential system it would seem to be the purpose of the Church to make its children rely exclusively on the treasure to avoid the punishment due to sin, and to induce them in every way to avail themselves of its graces. As Father Lépicier says, there has been, since the sixteenth century, a noble strife between the papacy and the people as to who should be foremost, the former in granting, the latter in gaining, indulgences, until the Church may be said to have reached the climax of liberality.[1] Unfortunately he does not explain how this is to be reconciled with the Tridentine decree, but its source is doubtless to be found in the laxer morality introduced by Probabilism and triumphant in the adoption of Liguori's system. This, as we have seen, looks rather to the escaping than the satisfying of the justice of God: to relieve the sinner of the consequences of his sin rather than to train him to its avoidance.

When, during the counter-Reformation, indulgences, except the cruzada, ceased to be a financial resource to the Holy See, it became more and more liberal in its use of them for the purpose of stimulating acts of devotion and enabling the religious Orders to extend their influence and acquire the alms of the faithful. The latter object has already been fully illustrated, and it only remains for us

[1] Lépicier, Indulgences etc. p. 329.—"Never was such a prodigality witnessed in ages past. New grants come out every day."—Ibid. p. 340.

to consider the former. In the effort to extend the market, while indulgences were salable, the price had been so reduced that when it came to fixing an equivalent in pious exercises there seems to have been felt a necessity of offering large rewards for little work. Thus, in 1592, when Clement VIII. introduced in Rome the forty hours' prayer, through which perpetual and unceasing adoration should ascend to God, in order to popularize it he offered a plenary to any one who should pray for an hour in a church in which the service was proceeding, while a shorter period was rewarded with seven years and quarantines.[1] In 1692 Innocent XII. granted to the Observantine Franciscans and members of their confraternities a hundred days for fifteen minutes spent in mental prayer, and a plenary every month in which this exercise is performed daily; Benedict XIV. extended this to all the faithful, and this is also obtainable by those who teach the practice of meditation and those who are learning it.[2] There is a monthly plenary granted, in 1728, by Benedict XIII., and confirmed by Benedict XIV. in 1756, for the daily recitation of acts of Faith, Hope and Charity, either according to a specific formula or in any words setting forth these respective virtues.[3] In 1770 Clement XIV. extended to all the faithful, what had previously been the special privilege of the Confraternity of the Trinity, a hundred days for a recital, and a monthly plenary for the daily repetition of the short canticle known as the Trisagion.[4] Equally facile is the prayer *Angele Dei*, addressed to the guardian angel, for which, in 1795, Pius VI. granted a hundred days for each utterance, with a plenary on the feast of guardian angels (October 2d) for two recitations daily; in 1796, for a daily recitation he promised a plenary at death, and, in 1821, Pius VII. converted this into a monthly plenary.[5] There is a plenary on the twenty-fifth day of each month and three hundred days on other

[1] Amort de Indulg. I. 213.

[2] Decr. Authent. Append n. 8.—Raccolta, p. 480.—Golden Book of the Confraternities, p. 279.—Blot, Indulgences qu'ou peut gagner chez soi, p. 28.

[3] Decr. Authent. n. 225.

[4] Raccolta, p. 3.—Golden Book, p. 266.—"Holy, holy, holy, Lord God of Hosts; all the earth is full of His glory; glory be to the Father, glory be to the Son, and glory be to the Holy Ghost."

[5] Decr. Authent. n. 395.—Raccolta, p. 348.—Golden Book, p. 276.—"O Angel of God to whose holy care I am committed by thy supreme clemency, enlighten, defend, protect and govern me."

days, conceded by Pius VII., in 1819, for reading in a church a short devotion on the Mysteries of the Infancy of Jesus, occupying about a page and a half, with three Paters and twelve Aves.[1] Doubts having arisen as to a plenary granted by Clement VIII. and confirmed by subsequent popes, for simply reciting before a crucifix the prayer *En ego*, addressed to Jesus, Pius IX., in 1858, defined it to be valid when accompanied with a prayer for the intention of the pope.[2] There is a pious exercise known as the Seven Sorrows and Seven Joys of St. Joseph, consisting of seven brief prayers to him, each accompanied with a Pater. Ave and Gloria. For this successive popes granted increasing indulgences until there was a plenary to be obtained by reciting it for seven successive Sundays, and finally Pius IX., in 1847, increased this to a plenary for each of the Sundays, and, for the benefit of those who cannot read, omitted the prayers, so that they gain the same plenaries by merely repeating on each day seven Paters, Aves and Glorias.[3] These will serve as examples of a host of equally simple observances whereby, with trifling exertion, the faithful can secure an endless series of plenaries. As for partials, they are distributed with still greater liberality. When Pius IX. deplored the declining use of holy water, he offered, in 1866, a hundred days for every time one should cross himself with holy water and invoke the Trinity.[4] The little devotional exercises known as ejaculations are equally well rewarded. Sixtus V. seems to have set the fashion, in 1587, by giving fifty days for saying "Praised be Jesus Christ!" and for responding "Amen!" or "Forever!" and this was increased by a hundred days by Benedict XIII. in 1728, while Clement XIII., in 1762, accepted for the Carmelites the addition of the name of Mary to that of Jesus, and, in 1864, Pius IX. extended this to the faithful at large.[5] There are many of these pious phrases in honor of divine and holy personages which are thus enriched, of which two or three examples will suffice.

[1] Decr. Authent. n. 428.—Raccolta, p. 78.

[2] Decr. Authent. n. 495, 539, 718.—Raccolta, p. 139.—Golden Book, p. 247.

[3] Decr. Authent. n. 617.—Raccolta, p. 360–5. The *Gloria* is simply the final clause of the Trisagion, "Glory be to the Father etc."

[4] Huguet, Vertu Miraculeuse de l'eau bénite, p. 29.—Raccolta, p. 17. For the simple invocation, accompanied with the sign of the cross, there is an indulgence of fifty days (Ibid. p. 16).

[5] Ferraris, s. v. *Indulgentia* Art. VI. n. 1.—Decr. Authent. n. 248–9, 759.

In 1852 Pius IX. granted three hundred days for each utterance of "Sweetest Heart of Mary be my salvation!" and a plenary every month for its daily repetition.[1] It is significant of the inferior position of Christ, as an object to which popular devotion is to be stimulated, that it was not till 1868 that the Heart of Jesus was recognized by giving three hundred days for the ejaculation "Jesus, kindly and humble of heart, make my heart be as Thine!" and then there was no monthly plenary offered, while only a hundred days are promised for "Eternal Father, I offer Thee the most precious blood of Jesus Christ for the redemption of my sins and the needs of the Church!"[2] The rising devotion for St. Joseph is recognized in the ejaculation "O St. Joseph, friend of the Sacred Heart, pray for us!" for which, in 1874, Pius IX. promised a hundred days, but limited it to once a day.[3]

Another prolific source of facile indulgences is the composition of new prayers and procuring their enrichment with pardons to popularize and disseminate them. It is quite natural that a pious soul who has condensed his devotional emotion in some new form of supplication to the divinity or to a saint, or in some suffrage for the dead, should seek thus to obtain for it the approbation of the Holy See, and the Congregation of Indulgences was so pestered with applications of the kind that it appealed, in 1777, to Pius VI. for relief, and procured from him a decree that no further petitions of this nature should be entertained—a decision which had to be repeated in 1816 by Pius VII.[4] This, however, did not prevent the concession of new indulgences for such objects when urged by officials of influence. Thus, in 1851, at the instance of the Jesuit General, a hundred days was granted for the morning and evening recitation of a short prayer to the Virgin against temptation, with a monthly

[1] Decr. Authent. n. 666.—Raccolta, p. 293.

[2] Decr. Authent. n. 769.—Raccolta, p. 181.—Le Mois des Âmes du Purgatoire, p. 5.

[3] Raccolta, p. 368. It is perhaps worth noting that in the latest edition of the Raccolta there are thirteen indulgenced devotions to God, three to the Holy Ghost, sixty-one to Jesus personally, nineteen to the Sacrament, sixty to the Virgin, and twelve to St. Joseph. In the "Golden Book" it will be observed how much more prominence is allotted to the devotions to the Virgin than to those to God or to Christ.

[4] Decr. Authent. n. 403.

plenary for its daily use.[1] It is no wonder that the great name of S. Alfonso de' Liguori should command, in 1821, three hundred days for a recital of his prayer "O Madre di Dio," with a monthly plenary for daily repetition.[2] The same had shortly before been given for a short prayer to Christ, and, in 1827 and 1828, we find several with three or one hundred days and monthly plenaries to Christ, to the Virgin, and to San Juan de la Cruz.[3] The process has continued, with the natural result of enabling the devotee to obtain any desired number of partials and plenaries.

The canonization of new saints affords another extensive field for the multiplication of indulgences. There are fashions in devotion, and the older saints are well-nigh lost to sight in the stimulus thus afforded to the cult of the more recent ones. A powerful body like the Jesuits could thus secure popular reverence for their especial saints, as when, after the canonization of S. Luigi Gonzaga, Benedict XIII. granted a plenary for visiting his altar on his feast (June 21st) and he became so renowned for his miracles that the Jesuit churches could not hold the crowds flocking to them on that day, leading Benedict XIV., in 1742, to extend the indulgence to other days to be determined by the bishops, although, in 1739 and 1740, Clement XII. had granted a plenary on each of the six Sundays preceding June 21st (or any other six consecutive Sundays) for any work of devotion in honor of the saint.[4] The boy-saint, St. Stanislas Kostka is another example of Jesuit influence: by various decrees from 1821 to 1827 a plenary was granted for visiting his altar on his feast (November 13th); then there came a hundred days and a monthly plenary for reciting a Pater and Ave before his image, and, finally, in 1854, three hundred days and a monthly plenary for three short prayers addressed to him.[5] It is a noteworthy illustration of the tendencies of modern devotion that in the Raccolta of 1855, with its supplement to 1865, we may look in vain for the great names which have illumined the history of the Church in by-gone ages; their cult has become obsolete and has been superseded by that of the moderns. The list, in fact, is significant, containing only St. Joseph, SS. Peter

[1] Decr. Authent. n. 646.—Raccolta, pp. 291–2.
[2] Decr. Authent. n. 437.—Raccolta, pp. 276–77.
[3] Decr. Authent. n. 434, 460, 462, 463, 464.
[4] Decr. Authent. n. 89, 111.—Raccolta, p. 429.
[5] Decr. Authent. n. 435, 456, 461, 616.—Raccolta, pp. 425–7.

and Paul, St. Pius V., St. Nicholas of Bari, S. Francisco di Paola, S. Luigi Gonzaga, S. Stanislas Kostka, S. Filippo Neri, S. Camillo de Lellis, and St. Elizabeth of Hungary. The deficiency was partially repaired in the increase of indulgences during the next two decades, for in the Raccolta of 1886 we find, in addition to the above, the following, who represent several of the influences which have predominated during the past quarter of a century: St. Joachim, St. Anne, St. Gregory VII., St. Dominic, St. Francis, St. Ignatius Loyola, St. Vincent de Paul, S. Paolo della Croce, St. Anthony of Padua, St. Thomas Aquinas, S. Juan de la Cruz, S. Andrea Avellino, S. Michele de' Santi, S. Benoit Joseph Labre, St. Lucia, St. Agnes and St. Barbara. Curiously enough the Blessed Tommaso di Cori does not appear in either edition of the Raccolta, although in 1852 a response and prayer addressed to him were enriched with a hundred days and a monthly plenary, with the addition that those unable to read can acquire it by the simple recital of three Paters, Aves, and Glorias in his honor.[1]

Asiatic Catholics have not been overlooked, although the mass of indulgences has not been specifically extended to them, presumably because they are not familiar with the infinite variety of observances on which these depend. To meet their wants a simplified and sufficiently comprehensive grant was made to them, in 1817, by Pius VII. of two plenaries a month and on some twenty feasts, for merely visiting a church and praying for the extension of the faith and the exaltation of the Roman Church, confession and communion being of course conditioned. They also have the benefit of indulgenced objects and death-bed plenaries.[2]

All this cloud of indulgences so profusely offered to the faithful have as their object simply to stimulate devotional exercises, and this is regarded as ample cause to justify this lavish distribution of the treasure. Indeed, Ferraris, the recognized authority on the subject, calmly tells us that Innocent IV. has granted thirty thousand years to all who devoutly hear or celebrate mass, to which Urban IV., Eugenius IV., Martin V. and Sixtus IV. have each added

[1] Decr. Authent. n. 668.

[2] Elcesaei Series Indulgentiarum quæ Christifidelibus in Orientalibus plagis concessæ sunt. Arabice et Latine. Romæ, 1817.

two hundred years, making 30,800 in all.[1] It matters little that all this is fictitious; the significance of it lies in the fact that Ferraris accepts and promulgates it as an undoubted exercise of the papal power and sees in it nothing objectionable. One is tempted to ask what can be the real value of observances thus bargained and paid for—of the orisons and ejaculations that are prompted, not by an earnest seeking after God, but by the promise that so many repetitions will win escape from the punishment due to sin—and what is the character of the repentance which the devotee is thus called upon to experience periodically. The value thus officially assigned to these pietistic exercises is a striking proof of the distance which the Church has wandered from the gospel when it thus stimulates and rewards the formulas of which Christ knew nothing, and holds in comparative contempt the works of neighborly love and kindness which it was his chief mission to preach. There can be little question that the practical application of the second great Commandment could be largely developed by the judicious use of indulgences, but it is deplorable to turn from the profuseness lavished on barren formulas to the scanty rewards offered for works reflecting the true Christian spirit of benevolence. We have seen (p. 188) how few during the middle ages were the grants of this character, and the same is true to-day. Amid the wilderness of indulgences assembled and arranged in the Raccolta of 1855 the section devoted to works of mercy contains only three items, and the section itself disappears wholly in the edition of 1886. The spirit which governs the Church in its dispensation of the treasure is well expressed by one of its weightiest authorities: if an indulgence is conditioned on almsgiving, and if its object is to relieve the sufferings of the poor, it is gained by the smallest contribution, even from a rich man, but if it is to build a church or to raise an army, as in the old crusading times, the amount must be substantial and proportioned to the wealth of the sinner.[2] Another development of the ecclesiastical spirit is visible in one of the rare indulgences for works of mercy—a very liberal concession by Pius VII., in 1815, of seven years and quarantines, which can be made a plenary by confession and communion, for feeding three paupers; but then it must be done, not as an outcome of Chris-

[1] Ferraris s. v. *Indulgentia* Art. VI. n. 6.

[2] Theodori a Spiritu Sancto de Jubilæo Cap. VI. § 5, n. 2.

tian kindness, but especially in honor of Jesus, the Virgin and St. Joseph.[1] Pietistic formalism must control even so simple an act.

A few instances can be found of indulgences for charitable deeds, but their scantiness and niggardliness only render the contrast all the stronger. In 1570 St. Pius V. granted ten years and quarantines for helping the shipwrecked,[2] an idea probably suggested to him by his preparations for the naval campaign against the Turks. We have seen (p. 518) that helping the poor and visiting prisons and hospitals and teaching Christian doctrine are included among the works prescribed for indulgenced objects, and amid the extravagant concessions to the Carmelite scapular confirmed by Clement X., in 1673, there is a trifle of a hundred days for works of charity and beneficence.[3] Pius VI., in 1778, offered the same small inducement for visiting hospitals and giving the inmates spiritual and other assistance, and, in 1806, Pius VII., who seems to have felt an interest in a recently established Roman institution—a *Casa di Refugio* for discharged female convicts—aided it by offering to contributors a plenary at the time of contribution and on the death-bed, and also on the feast of St. John the Evangelist. Apparently the contributions were fixed at a considerable sum, for he added special indulgences of two hundred days for helping the inmates spiritually or temporarily, sixty days for giving bread or alms to the institution, and the same for alms to enable the women to marry or enter a convent.[4] When, in 1755, the General of the Order of San Juan de Dios asked for indulgences for those who should aid the sick in the hospitals of the Order, the most that Benedict XIV., usually so liberal with the treasure, would give was a hundred days, and even this was conditioned on confession and communion, which is unusual with partials.[5] So little are indulgences expected for such matters that the hundred days offered by Pius VI., in 1778, was supposed to be limited to Rome, and it was not until 1850 that Pius IX. removed the doubt by extending it to the Christian world.[6] No more laudable object could be suggested than that for which the Société de Saint François Regis was founded in Paris in 1826—to

---

[1] Raccolta, p. 484. [2] Amort de Indulg. I. 212.

[3] Guglielmi, Recueil des Indulgences, p. 204.—Jouhanneaud, Dict. des Indulgences, p. 726.

[4] Raccolta, pp. 374-6 (Ed. 1855). These are not in the edition of 1886.

[5] Decr. Authent. n. 223. [6] Decr. Authent. n. 741.

provide funds and aid the poor, living in concubinage, to be married, and to see that their children are baptized and legitimated, yet when Gregory XVI., in 1834, encouraged the work with indulgences he granted to members only a plenary once a year and at death, ten years when meeting on business, and the same when present at the marriage of those who had lived in scandalous concubinage or when acting as godfather or godmother to an illegitimate child.[1] There is an instructive contrast between this and the favor shown to the *Societas Calobibliophilorum*, founded at Imola, in 1824, for the dissemination of pious literature. All the officers can get a weekly plenary, all aiding and assisting two plenaries a month, and any one who writes for the Society a book "advantageous to the Church or the Holy See" a weekly plenary.[2]

If there were any labor which an enlightened Church would stimulate with spiritual rewards one would think it to be that of teaching the rudiments of religion. The council of Trent recognized its extreme importance and ordered Christian doctrine to be taught in every parish under pain of ecclesiastical censures.[3] Apparently the parochial authorities were not to be aroused from their torpor, and the customary device of an Archconfraternity for the purpose was resorted to. Pius V. and Paul V. encouraged its work with indulgences—seven years for schoolmasters who on feast-days will take their scholars to the *Dottrina Cristiana* and teach them; a hundred days for teaching them on working days; fathers and mothers teaching their children and servants a hundred days each time; those learning in order to teach, a hundred days for each half-hour; seven years for all assembling in churches to teach. In 1735 Clement XII. added seven years and quarantines to all who, after confession and communion, are present where the catechism is taught or who teach it; for those who have the pious habit of being present or teaching, three plenaries a year.[4] This is all apparently that has been offered

[1] Decr. Authent. n. 478, 480.

[2] Decr. Authent. n. 445.

[3] C. Trident. Sess. XXIV. De Reform. Cap. 4.

[4] Raccolta, pp. 371–2 (Ed. 1855).

In 1622 Gregory XVI. offered larger indulgences to a Society for teaching Christian Doctrine (Amort de Indulg. I. 214), but as there is no reference to it in the Raccolta, I presume it is long since extinct. There are also the *Scholæ Piæ*, founded by San José Calasanz, under the care of a congregation of Regular Clerics, to whose churches, in 1750, Benedict XIV. gave a privileged altar, and

thus far, and even this is omitted from the Raccolta of 1886, all of which contrasts unpleasantly with the liberality showered on scapulars and chaplets and ejaculations. Indulgences have become so universal a coinage wherewith to pay for all services and all observances that those whose sympathies lead them to aid their fellow-creatures cannot but feel that there is a lesson conveyed by the systematic distinction made against such labors.

It is possible that this may be explained, partially at least, with respect to works of practical charity, by the policy of the Church, which tends to monopolize for its organized institutions all assistance rendered to the necessitous, who are thus taught to look to it alone for relief in their misery. All benevolent enterprises are under its control and management, and it seems to think it better that the charitable impulses of the humane should operate through its machinery rather than in individual beneficence. The wonderful career of such a body as the Little Sisters of the Poor shows how much can be accomplished in this manner, and that there is no lack of willingness on the part of the laity to help such efforts, irrespective of indulgences. Moreover, when the fostering hand of the Church can be seen and its control acknowledged, there is probably no indisposition to stimulate and encourage charitable labors with spiritual rewards. I have not, it is true, been able to find any general offer of indulgences to reward the self-sacrificing work of the good women who devote their lives, under ecclesiastical organization, to the relief of the sufferings of their fellow-creatures, but when, in 1843, the sisters of the hospitals of St. John Lateran, S. Giacomo and S. Gallicano asked for indulgences, they were granted on a liberal scale

---

Clement XIV., in 1770, a day in which those visiting them gained a plenary (Decr. Authent. n. 192, 349).

An *Œuvre pie des Soldats*, founded in France to teach soldiers the rudiments of learning and doctrine, applied, in 1851, to Pius IX. for indulgences, and received for all collaborators five plenaries a year and seven years for each attendance at a meeting to teach or to learn (Decr. Authent. n. 642). Some night schools for religion in Rome about the same time asked for indulgences, and received them, but the details are not given (Ibid. n. 651).

These are all the encouragements for such labor that I have been able to find, but in suggestive contrast is the stimulation given to the formation among scholars of *La Milice du Pape*, to members of which there is a *toties quoties* indulgence of three hundred days for the simple ejaculation "Sweet Heart of Jesus be my love!"—Beringer, p. 605.

—sixty days for each pious work, a plenary on assuming the habit, on making profession, on renewing the vows, on twelve feasts in the year, every month for spiritual retreat, besides the Stations of Rome and the Portiuncula.[1] It is also to be borne in mind that the organized beggary of the Mendicant Orders since the thirteenth century has rendered indiscriminate almsgiving a duty among Catholics vastly more imperative than is admitted by the theories of modern Protestant sociologists.

Although in recent times the distribution of the treasure is mostly directed to stimulating pietistic formalism, its use for ulterior objects has not been wholly lost to view. The faithful can no longer be thus summoned to arms to further the political designs of the Holy See, or to contribute of their substance to cover Europe with splendid cathedrals; indulgences have become too common for their promise to excite to supreme effort, but still they possess sufficient potency to be occasionally used as a means to an end. In 1699 the condition of Catholicism in England and Ireland excited the liveliest sympathy of Innocent XII., and to prevent its total destruction he ordered processions to be held everywhere, promising a plenary to all who would take part in them or pray in the churches to the same effect. So when, in 1701, the war of the Spanish Succession broke out, Clement XI. offered a plenary throughout Italy and the adjacent islands to those who would assemble on stated days in designated churches and pray for peace.[2] In the threatening days of 1848 Pius IX. endeavored in May to stem the rising tide by a prayer, for the recitation of which he offered a hundred days and a monthly plenary for its daily utterance; as things grew worse in August he made the same grant for the prayer *Respice Domine*, and in September he bethought him that an Italian translation of the prayer of May might popularize the devotion, but all this did not avert the rising in Rome on November 16th and the flight to Gaetà on the 24th.[3] The fall of the short-lived republic was celebrated in the same way. The French under Oudinot entered Rome July 2, 1849, and, on August 12th, Cardinal Patrizzi, as Vicar-General, in an address deplored that the majority of the people had not felt due

[1] Decr. Authent. n. 577.
[2] Collect. Bullar. *penes me.*
[3] Decr. Authent. n. 631, 632, 633.

horror at the monstrous abuses committed against the majesty of God; to placate the divine wrath he ordered that on the 19th, 20th, and 21st, in fourteen designated churches there should be an exposition of the Sacrament, when all present should gain a partial of seven years and quarantines, to be converted into a plenary by a second visit.[1] Restored to power, Pius IX., in 1850, re-erected the Catholic hierarchy of England, and accompanied this with an offer of three hundred days to all who should pray for the conversion of the stubborn islanders.[2] The new dogma of the Immaculate Conception, proclaimed December 8, 1854, was by no means unanimously favored; to popularize it Pius, December 11th, indulgenced a chaplet of the Immaculate Heart of the Virgin with three hundred days for a single recitation and a monthly plenary for a daily repetition. It was quite long and laborious, and apparently was not largely adopted, so to facilitate the devotion, in June, 1855, he offered the same indulgences for three utterances of the ejaculation "Blessed be the holy and immaculate conception of the most Blessed Virgin Mary!" each to be followed by a Pater, three Aves and a Gloria. To clinch the matter, on the twenty-fifth anniversary of the promulgation of the dogma, Leo XIII. offered a plenary for simply visiting a church on the feast of the Conception (December 8th), or during the octave and praying for intention.[3]

In the increasing troubles encompassing the Holy See, Leo XIII., in 1883, bethought him of the same means to excite the sympathies of the populations. The dangers of the Church, he announced, are scarce less than when Dominic overcame the Albigenses with the rosary, a devotion which experience has shown to be peculiarly acceptable to the Virgin, and as she delights in helping those who appeal to her, there can be no doubt that she will grant the prayers of the whole Church and intercede to placate her Son. Therefore, during the approaching month of October he ordered in all churches the recital of at least one-third of the rosary, together with the litany of Loreto, and all the faithful present at these services were offered seven years and quarantines and a plenary for ten attendances. On December 24th he proclaimed that his commands had been obeyed

[1] Jouhanneaud, Dict. des Indulgences, p. 254.

[2] Raccolta, p. 458 (Ed. 1855).

[3] Raccolta, pp. 297–301.—Leonis PP. XIII. Decr. *Quintus et vicesimus*, 20 Sept. 1879 (Acta, I. 291).

everywhere with enthusiasm, the churches had been crowded and the prayer had ascended to Mary from the whole world.[1] In spite of the success of the device the end was not attained, and in August, 1884, Leo felt obliged to announce that the dangers threatening the Church were increasing, and besides the Asiatic cholera was infesting Italy, wherefore a repetition of the devotion and of the indulgences was ordered; in 1885 there was still occasion for the supplication, and its continuance was commanded every year until the deplorable condition of the Church should be relieved and the pope be restored to full liberty. Even the extraordinary jubilee of 1886 was not suffered to suspend it. Apparently after a few years there was a falling off of devotion, for in 1892 and 1893 eloquent exhortations to stimulate it were issued.[2] From a worldly point of view, Leo was more successful when, in order to fitly celebrate, on January 1, 1888, the fiftieth anniversary of his ordination, he published, October 1, 1887, a plenary indulgence for all who should come to Rome to offer him due honor and obedience, to all who should help others to come, and to all who should in thought and heart accompany them, on condition of reciting a third of the rosary for nine days prior to the anniversary and repeating it during the period assigned for the pilgrimage. The result seems to have been satisfactory, for in August, 1888, he attributed to the devotion which he had excited for the rosary the magnificent demonstrations and gifts which had attended his jubilee, wherefore he provided for it a special office and a mass for the feast of the rosary on the first Sunday of October.[3]

[1] Leonis PP. XIII. Encyc. *Supremi Apostolatus*, 1 Sept. 1883 (Acta, III. 280); Litt. Apostol. *Salutaris ille*, 24 Dec. 1883 (Ibid. 299).

In this latter, still further to propitiate the Virgin, he ordered in the Loreto litany after the words "Regina sine labe originali concepta" the insertion of "Regina sacratissimi Rosarii ora pro nobis." To the ordinary mind it is not easy to grasp the train of thought leading to the conclusion that the Virgin is to be propitiated by making the rosary her chief claim to devotion, but it affords an instructive example of the tendency to substitute the symbol for the thing symbolized, which is the underlying principle of fetishism.

[2] Leonis PP. XIII. Encyc. *Superiore anno*, 30 Aug. 1884 (Acta, IV. 123); Decr. *Inter plurimos* (Ib. V. 99); Decr. *Post editas*, 26 Aug. 1886; Epist. *Più volte*, 31 Oct. 1886 (Ib. VI. 162, 203); Decr. *Inter densas*, 16 Sept. 1887; Epist. *Vi è ben noto*, 20 Sept 1886 (Ib. VII. 188, 191); Epist. Encyc. *Magnæ Dei*, 8 Sept. 1892 (Ib. XII. 221); Litt. Encyc. *Lætitiæ sanctæ*, 9 Sept 1893 (Ib. XIII. 283).

[3] Leonis PP. XIII. Litt. Apostol. *Quod primo*, 1 Oct. 1887 (Acta, VII. 199); Decr. *Diuturnis*, 5 Aug. 1888 (Ib. VIII. 284).

Another prolific source of indulgence is the papal benediction, carrying with it a plenary, to obtain which annual confession at Easter suffices. We have seen (p. 199) that in the time of Boniface VIII. the papal benediction, even in St. Peter's, only conferred a hundred days, but it grew with the rest, and the popes have long been accustomed to bestow a plenary with their blessing on the crowds assembled for the purpose in front of St Peter's on Holy Thursday, at the Lateran on Ascension, and at St. Maria Maggiore on the Assumption of the Virgin—days on which they officiate in those churches and then bless the multitude from a balcony. Since 1870 the prisoner of the Vatican has been unable to perform this function, but the papal benediction does not require to be pronounced orally or in person. It can be transmitted, as when, in 1612, Paul V. sent it to Peter of Antioch, Patriarch of the Maronites, and desired it bestowed on clergy and people and all their possessions. It can likewise be deputized; bishops generally have the faculty of bestowing it twice a year, either in their churches or on the crowd collected in front, and it has been decided that to obtain the indulgence it suffices to be at a window overlooking the place. Even simple priests sometimes have the power to grant it, and, in 1867, Pius IX. conferred this for a single time on all those having cure of souls who came to Rome on the centenary of St. Peter, June 29th. It is likewise enjoyed by the superiors of the various religious Orders, but they can only perform it in their own churches and must select other days than those chosen by the bishops.[1] The number of plenaries which may thus be distributed among the faithful is incomputable. Somewhat similar to this is the special favor sometimes granted to individual priests, whereby anyone hearing a mass celebrated by him or receiving the sacrament at his hands, obtains a plenary,[2] but this I think is probably now obsolete, as I have met with no recent reference to it; although it is paralleled by the personal privileged altar which is still occasionally bestowed (p. 366).

These are not the only personal privileges connected with indulgences. The pope, we are told, can grant himself a special indulgence without extending it to others, and he can release himself from any

---

[1] Beringer, pp. 282–3.—Amort de Indulg. I. 214.—Bouvier, p. 228.—Decr. Authent. n. 153, 214, 261, 347, 348, 502, 521, 532, 768.

[2] Pignatelli, Il Giubileo dell' Anno Santo, p. 306.

penance enjoined on him in the sacrament of penitence.[1] These are probably mere theoretical speculations, but partiality has sometimes been shown to sinners of exalted rank. Thus a concession by Benedict XIV., in 1749, to the church of the Canons Regular of Hiezing, near the imperial palace of Vienna, provides that members of the imperial family can gain a plenary every time they visit it when duly confessed and communed, while their servants and courtiers can gain one monthly, and other Christians on fourteen designated feasts. About the same time Benedict conferred on the royal family of Spain the special privilege of a plenary for prayer before a certain reliquary after confession and communion, while if only contrite they obtained five years and quarantines.[2] A still more remarkable example of favoritism is the concession to certain families of indulgences which descend by inheritance from one generation to another. In 1818 the Congregation of Indulgences was asked whether a member of such a family forfeited this spiritual heritage on entering a religious Order, and the answer, with the approbation of Pius VII., was in the negative.[3]

The increasing development of indulgences during the last two centuries has been to some extent controlled by the character of the successive pontiffs. Benedict XIII. was liberal in his dispensation of the treasure; Clement XII. less so; then Benedict XIV. set an example of profusion, which was not imitated by Clement XIII., while Clement XIV. was quite sparing. A fresh impulse was given by Pius VI., which grew under Pius VII., and continued until Pius IX. outstripped all his predecessors, in consequence doubtless of his emotional nature and the mystic enthusiasm which led him to believe

[1] Pignatelli, p. 43.

[2] Decr. Authent. n. 178, 186.

[3] Decr. Authent. n. 413. There has been some talk of indulgences for bull-fighting in Spain, but this appears to me very questionable. Richard Ford (Quart. Rev. LXII. 409), on the authority of Peyron (Essais sur l'Espagne et Voyage faite en 1777 et 1778, Genève, 1780), says that the Franciscans of Seville, when desirous of building a convent, obtained permission to exhibit eight bull-feasts, which entitled the spectators to several years' indulgences. Such a story could readily be passed on a credulous traveller. The Comtesse d'Aulnoy (La Cour et la Ville de Madrid, Lett. x.) states that there are indulgences offered in many churches on the days of the exhibitions, but as she gives this in illustration of the murderous character of the sport, these are evidently for the benefit of the slain.

himself under the direct inspiration of the Holy Ghost. The calmer and more self-contained character of Leo XIII. has led to a less lavish employment of his functions in this direction, and his grants have been largely influenced by objects to be attained by them.

It is no wonder that this ever-increasing flood has called forth occasional expression of disapprobation and remonstrance. Even before the profuseness of general indulgences which marked the eighteenth century, the facility with which local ones were granted to all suppliants awakened doubts as to their validity and value, which Christian Wolff combats, while admitting that they ought to be used only as helps to the zeal with which the sinner should strive to satisfy for his sins.[1] Soon after this the only protest against them —and that only a silent protest—was extinguished in the condemnation of Molinos. The mystics had always looked with contempt on scholastic theology, of which indulgences were one of the specific products. They relied upon Scripture, and their aim was to bring the soul into direct relations with God, thus disregarding all formal observances and sacerdotal intermediation. In the earliest proceedings of the Spanish Inquisition against the *Alumbrados* or mystics, disbelief in the value of indulgences forms a feature of the charges; in the case of María Cazalla, in 1532, she was accused of ridiculing them, and in her defence she brought witnesses to prove that she bought all the bulls sold by the popes to Catholics, not only for herself and children, but for her servants and for a slave whom she owned, and that she joined the ladies of Orche in begging alms to buy them for the poor.[2] Carranza, Archbishop of Toledo, who had largely aided Philip II. in suppressing heresy in England and Flanders, and who perished under the persecution of the Inquisition, was a moderate mystic. In the book which led to his downfall, a bulky folio exposition of Catholic doctrine in the vernacular, the sections in which indulgences would naturally be alluded to have no references to them. In treating of the communion of saints he sets forth the current doctrine that each member of the Church participates in the merits of all the rest, but he abstains from explaining that this common treasure is distributed by the popes in the form of indulgences. All external works, moreover, depend for their

[1] Christ. Lupi de Indulgentiis Cap. x.

[2] Melgares Marin, Procedimientos de la Inquisicion, II. 27, 31, 45–6, 86, 110.

efficacy wholly on the spirit which animates them; without love and charity they are worthless. This tacit disapprobation went as far as was safe in a land where the sale of the cruzada bulls was pushed to the utmost as a source of large revenue to the state, with a share to the Holy See. This reticence was wise, for after a trial lasting nearly twenty years, in the sixteen propositions which Gregory XIII. finally required him to abjure, there is no reference to any heresy on the subject of indulgences beyond the propositions that works without charity are sins and that faith without works is sufficing.[1] In a trial, about 1650, in the Inquisition of Mexico, of Joseph Bruñon de Vertiz for mysticism, one of the questions put to him is whether he took the bulls of the cruzada, which was evidently one of the tests of orthodoxy.[2] When finally Rome was awakened to the dangers which lurked in mystic Quietism and the battle over it was fought out in the case of Miguel Molinos, one of the propositions drawn from his writings, as set forth in the bull of condemnation, Nov. 19, 1687, is that it is not well to seek indulgences for the punishment due to our sins, for it is better to satisfy divine justice than to seek divine mercy, since the former proceeds from pure love of God and the latter from love of self; it is not pleasing to God nor meritorious, for it is to fly from the cross. There is in this a full admission of the power of indulgences and only a denial of their usefulness to souls of the highest aspirations, and the same is true of some propositions contained in his sentence, though not included in the bull—that the effort to help souls in purgatory is a work of nature and not of charity; it is an endeavor to make God lean in favor of one soul rather than of another, because of kinship, and is therefore not to be done by those striving for the highest way; moreover, a soul in purgatory should not desire to be helped, but should resign itself to the will of God in suffering as in bliss.[3] There would seem to be in all this no heresy, but it implied a reproof of the current practice of the Church, and though this was less damaging than the total ignoring of the subject by Carranza, it was felt to need the most solemn form of reprobation.

[1] Carranza, Comentarios, P. I. Art. nono, Cap. iii.; P. IV. Tercera Obra, Cap. iii.—Salazar de Mendoza, Vida de Carranza, Cap. 33.

[2] Proceso de D. Joseph Bruñon de Vertiz (MSS. of David Fergusson, Esq.).

[3] Innoc. PP. XI. Bull. *Cœlestis Pastor*, Prop. XVI. (Bullar. X. 213).—MSS. of Royal Library of Munich, Cod. Ital. 185.

The catastrophe of Molinos and the persecution of Madame Guyon and Fenélon virtually put an end to Quietism, and the last embers were stamped out, in 1708, by the trial of Padre Beccarelli in Brescia —probably a follower of Molinos, who continued to propagate his methods. He was said to have forty thousand disciples throughout Lombardy, embracing members of the noblest families. In his trial by the Inquisition one of the tenets ascribed to him was that sexual intercourse acquired a plenary indulgence *toties quoties*, which can be applied to the dead. He was condemned to seven years in the galleys, the *Beccarellisti* were broken up, and the Church has since then, outside of Spain, had little trouble with mystic illuminism.[1]

While there were, as we have seen (p. 111 sqq.), during the eighteenth century two opposing schools of laxism and rigorism, as to the requisites for the enjoyment of indulgences, there does not appear to have been any voice raised against the profusion of their emission till near the close of the century. In 1776 Jerome Colloredo, Archbishop of Salzburg, on the occasion of the extension to Germany of the jubilee of 1775, issued a pastoral, warning his people not to deceive themselves with the belief that by merely performing the enjoined works and gaining the indulgence they would escape the penalty of their sins, for a change of the inner man is also requisite. Apparently this produced little effect, for in 1782 he returned to the subject, blaming the priests who exaggerated the efficiency of the treasure and suppressed the conditions requisite for obtaining it; indulgences too numerous and facile, he says, degenerate into an abuse and destroy discipline, and he orders his priests to use every effort to remove the scandals which are so often the result of indulgences.[2] It was inevitable that this subject should form part of the comprehensive scheme of reform projected soon afterwards by Leopold of Tuscany. In his letter to his bishops, of January 26th, 1786, among the duties prescribed for the parish priests is the instruction of the people as to the true value of indulgences and of suffrages for the dead, as they are either wholly ignorant of them or

[1] Lämmer, Meletematum Romanorum Mantissa, pp. 428–31. Lämmer thinks that the Beccarellisti were Jansenists who desired to revive the ancient severity of penance rather than Quietists. Heppe (Geschichte der quietistischen Mystik, p. 445) regards him as a surviving disciple of Molinos.

[2] Dalham Concil. Salisburg. pp. 650, 653.—Atti del Concilio di Pistoja, Append. VIII.

misled with infinite errors.[1] To this the provincial council, which he assembled at Florence to carry out his views, responded in a perfunctory manner that the bishops would exhort their priests accordingly to correct abuses if any existed.[2] More active means than this were, however, taken to carry out the projected reform. Vincenzo Palmieri wrote a "Tractato storico-critico delle Indulgenze," published anonymously in 1786 and repeatedly reprinted, in which he treated the whole subject from a purely critical point of view, and provoked several rejoinders from the orthodox.[3] Palmieri was one of the theologians of the synod of Pistoja, held by Bishop Ricci, in 1786, and his opinions doubtless governed the action of that body, which was quite revolutionary. The development of indulgences was traced to the old commutations of penance, and their transformation to the invention of the treasure, whereby the application of the merits of Christ was substituted for the release from canonical penance, giving rise to the popular self-deceit as to the advantage of these pretended indulgences and the still more deplorable application to the dead, which has stimulated the furious multiplication of these promises and the absurd tablets displaying them in the churches, as well as the privileged altars. The synod expressed its desire to cure

---

[1] Atti del Concilio di Pistoja, p. 66.

[2] Schwartzel, Acta Congr. Archiep. et Episc. Hetruriæ, I. 322 (Bambergæ, 1790).

[3] I have not met with Palmieri's book and know it only from the anonymous answer to it—"Instruzione per un' Anima fedele sopre le Indulgenze contro i falsi ed erronei principj sparsi nel Trattato delle Medesime uscito da Pistoja l'anno 1786." Finale, 1787. In this it is spoken of as extensively circulated and doing much harm. Muzzarelli, a papal penitentiary and a much more formidable antagonist, likewise answered Palmieri in a work on the value of indulgences which is virtually translated in the Introduction to Jouhanneaud's "Dictionaire des Indulgences."

Palmieri also published, Genoa, 1816, "La perpetuità della fede della Chiesa cattolica intorno al dogma delle Indulgenze dimostrata." He died March 13, 1820; on his death-bed the sacraments were refused to him unless he would retract, but Archbishop Lambruschini, afterwards cardinal, induced him to sign a declaration that he was a faithful Catholic and submitted his writings to the judgment of the Church, whereupon the viaticum was administered. In the presence of two witnesses Palmieri repeated to his nephew the formula which he had signed. This the nephew published, when, after Palmieri's death, Lambruschini issued the submission in a more absolute shape.—Reusch, Der Index der verbot. Bücher, II. 963.

these disorders, but their inseparable connection with the system of penance rendered indispensable as a preliminary the revival of the penitential canons and their readjustment to modern necessities. This is hoped for from the bishop in time for the next synod to re-introduce the old indulgences which confessors can concede with due prudence under powers granted by the bishops, and meanwhile all tablets are ordered to be removed from the churches and all privileged altars to be discontinued.[1]

The tablets of indulgences were accordingly removed from the churches, to the great dissatisfaction of the people, who had been too long trained in the belief of their promises to acquiesce willingly in the deprivation of the spiritual comfort imparted by them. The change, in fact, was too sudden to be permanent; the soil had not been prepared for it, and ancestral habitudes could not be altered at the bidding of priests who but a year or two previous had been inculcating what they were now instructed to deny. Nor was the movement general throughout Tuscany. Ricci, in his see of Pistoja and Prato, was energetically seconding Leopold's projects of reform, but he had only two earnest colleagues among the bishops—Pannilini of Chiusi and Suarelli of Colle. The former, in an instruction issued the same year, tells his priests to teach the people that the long indulgences of a hundred or a thousand years are deceitful; even plenaries remove only a portion of the *pœna* and none of the *culpa*, and the faithful are mistaken in believing that any of them can be gained by short prayers and trifling pious exercises.[2] Suarelli, in 1787, issued a catechism on the subject to be used for the instruction of the people, which was sufficiently heterodox to merit a place on the Index.[3]

In the old days the Holy See would have issued an indulgence for a crusade against these heresies, but times had changed, and all that Pius VI. could do for the moment was to publish one in which two plenaries a month, besides others on the feasts of the Virgin and

---

[1] Atti del Concilio di Pistoja, pp. 152–3.

[2] Istruzione di Mgr. Vescovo di Chiusi e Pienza, §§ 37–38 (Firenze, 1786).

[3] Breve Catechismo sulle Indulgenze secondo la vera dottrina della Chiesa, proposto dal Vescovo di Colle ai suoi Parrochi per servirsene d'istruzione ai loro popolo. Colle, 1787. It was translated the next year and issued in Munster. It was prohibited in 1793, but was reprinted subsequently, and again prohibited in 1824.—Reusch, Der Index, II. 791–2.

All Saints, were promised for the recital, morning and evening, of certain prayers to God to bring the erring brethren back to the true path.[1] It is useless to speculate as to the probable result had Leopold been allowed to continue his work, but, as we have seen, he was called to the imperial throne by the death of Joseph II., in 1790. Ricci was forced to resign in 1791; his successor, Picchinesi, a strong papalist, restored the tablets and the privileged altars to the great joy of the faithful, and matters resumed their former course. After the death of Leopold, in 1792, it was safe to condemn the errors which he had fostered, and in 1794 appeared the bull *Auctorem Fidei*, in which the propositions of the synod of Pistoja on the subject of the nature of indulgences, the treasure, privileged altars, etc., were denounced as false, audacious, offensive to pious ears, insulting to Christ and to the Holy See, scandalous and opposed to the universal practice of the Church.[2]

This settled the matter, and the nineteenth century witnessed the unintermitted growth and multiplication of indulgences and their lavish distribution for the most trifling observances. The cooler heads in the Church looked on with growing disapprobation, until the convocation, in 1869, of the Vatican council seemed to offer an opportunity to call a halt. Prior to its assembling a number of French bishops, including the Archbishops of Paris and Sens, drew up some propositions to be submitted to it, in which the matter was frankly treated. Attention was called to the growing reduplication of indulgences and the facility with which the modern ones can be earned; it was asked that some proportion be observed between the prescribed works and the graces conceded; that prudence be observed in the formulas to the exclusion of expressions which lead the ignorant to imagine that sins are remitted and not merely the punishment of sin. The importance of certitude was pointed out, and the Congregation was asked to print an authoritative list of all indulgences to be translated into various languages under its supervision. The suppression was asked for, or at least the diminution, of the innumerable ones which are invalid for nullity of cause, leading the faithful into error, since they believe themselves to obtain indulgences which in reality they do not gain. This principally arises in those con-

[1] Istruzione per un' Anima fedele, pp. 237–40.

[2] Pii PP. VI. Bull. *Auctorem Fidei*, Prop. XL.–XLIII.

ceded to Archconfraternities, which are mostly null in consequence of the neglect in affiliations of the formalities prescribed by Clement VIII. under pain of invalidity. Finally, some general remedy was asked for, if possible, whereby the faithful shall not be deprived, without their fault, of the fruit of indulgences which they strive to gain, and which are invalid through some hidden cause of nullity.[1]

Of course, no attention was paid to this temperate presentation of the acknowledged evils arising from the heedless distribution of the treasure by the Holy See. In fact, it was practically answered by Pius on December 3, 1869, five days before the opening of the council, in a fresh indulgence, promising a plenary to all who, confessed and communed, during the sittings of the body, should daily for a week recite five decades of the Rosary and pray in a church for its success. And this was in addition to the extraordinary jubilee from June 1st to December 8, 1869, and numerous other plenaries and partials prior to and during the continuance of the council.[2] It is evident that no change is to be expected in the policy of the Holy See, and indeed even such a moderate reform as that suggested by the French bishops would imply a confession of wrong-doing incompatible with the decree of infallibility for which the Vatican council was assembled. The Church is fully committed to laxity, and Father Lépicier is able to boast that "we, with a few ejaculations, can discharge all our debt, and we have enough in our hands to avoid the excruciating pains of purgatory."[3]

---

[1] Concil. Collect. Lacensis, VII. 844.

[2] Ibid. pp. 1076, 1313, 1315. Pius IX. gave as a reason for employing the rosary in this indulgence that God has committed to the Virgin the function of destroying all heresy throughout the world. This is an old belief. In 1523 Aleander, in discussing the means of repressing Lutheranism, says "Imploretur Divæ Virginis patrocinium quæ cunctas hæreses sola interemit in universo mundo."—Hieron. Aleandri Consilium (Döllinger, Beiträge zur politischen, kirchlichen u. Cultur-Geschichte, III. 243). Her abstention in the case of Protestantism does not seem to have destroyed faith in her power.

[3] Lépicier, Indulgences, their Origin, Nature and Development, p. 345.

CHAPTER XIV.

APOCRYPHAL INDULGENCES.

Incidental allusion has frequently been made above to the fictitious and fraudulent indulgences which have always formed so large a part of those offered for the acceptance of the devout. In the ingenuity and audacity of fabricating these the churches everywhere —especially those of Rome—and the religious Orders have constantly rivalled each other. Many of these, through papal confirmation, tacit or express, have been validated, and are accepted as genuine. Others have been condemned, and have disappeared, or have continued to be exploited in spite of condemnation, owing to the profit that can be derived from them by deceiving the ignorant and credulous. The appetite of credulity is insatiable, and there never has been lacking astuteness to minister to its cravings.

The extreme meagreness of the early indulgences, except for crusading service, is a safe test for the forgeries which assume to date prior to the end of the fourteenth century. At the time when these were manufactured it would not have been worth the trouble to fabricate concessions of ten or forty days, or of a year and forty days, and the forgers naturally, in their desire for attractive grants and at the same time for an antiquity that would baffle investigation, committed the anachronism of attributing to periods before the invention of indulgences, or to popes who never granted any but moderate ones, terms which should stimulate the generosity of those who had grown accustomed to more lavish promises of pardon. Even as early as 1600 Baronius was candid enough to point out that the popes of the twelfth century made no grants of more than a year, except for crusades, and he quotes one of Alexander III., in 1177, to the church of Ferrara, after consecrating its high altar, of one year for mortals and a seventh for venials, to prove the falsity of the claim of the church of Ancona that Alexander granted to it for the first Sunday of each month indulgences for as many months as a man could hold of grains of sand in both hands. Yet the Anconitan church in 1515, and again

in 1605, endeavored to maintain the authenticity of this absurd claim by an immense array of priestly and notarial testimony.[1] Ample illustration has been given above of the extreme moderation of the early indulgences, but for purposes of comparison it may be worth while to mention here a single instance. The ancient monastery of Polling in Bavaria frequently sent envoys to the Holy See to solicit these favors, but up to the year 1391 all they had been able to obtain were one of forty days in 1263, of forty days in 1268 and 1281, of a hundred and forty days in 1283, of forty days in 1284 and 1288, of ten *carinas* in 1289, and of forty days in 1298 and 1300.[2]

In contrast with this the fraudulent character of the numerous early indulgences incidentally alluded to above becomes self-evident. Many of them show, like that of Ancona, that it is not easy to define the limits of the reckless audacity and inventiveness of their fabricators, nor is their prevalence difficult of explanation. The Church had long been accustomed to the use of forgery in substantiating its dogmas and its claims; nothing was easier than the fabrication of suppositious documents, as all students of diplomatics know; there were factories of papal letters in Rome and elsewhere, whose counterfeits readily passed current in an uncritical age.[3] The whole system of indulgences was interpenetrated with fraud, from the prelate or priest who framed the deceptions, to his agent the pardoner who consummated them among the people. The eagerness for gain was universal, and if perchance there were twinges of conscience they were readily soothed by the argument that the end in view was a

---

[1] Baron. Annal. ann. 1177, n. 49.—Amort de Indulg. I. 51.

[2] Amort de Indulg. II. 231.

[3] About 1185 Lucius III. orders the active prosecution of a gang of forgers of papal letters in England, whose successful industry had greatly reduced the respect felt there for such documents (Compil. II. Lib. v. Tit. ix. Cap. 1, 2). Soon afterward Cœlestin III. speaks of similar experts who had recently been discovered in Rome (Migne's Patrol. CCVI. 1252). His successor, Innocent III., on his accession, found another factory in full operation there (Regest. Lib. I. Epist. 235), and about the same time Stephen of Tournay discovered another in his episcopal city (De Reiffenberg, Chron. de Ph. Mousques, I. ccxxv). The practice continued and the forgery or falsification of papal letters remained one of the cases reserved in the bull *in Cœna Domini.*

An interesting sketch of the frauds so common in ancient documents, or those pretending to be ancient, will be found in Giry, *Manuel de Diplomatique*, Liv. VII. Ch ii. (Paris, 1894).

pious one—the building or repair of a church, the maintenance of its services, or the support of a hospital. Thus scarce had indulgences become a recognized portion of church discipline when the eagerness of the people to gain them was abused without scruple In the first attempt to regulate the system, at the Lateran council of 1216, these fraudulent practices were recognized as notorious, and prelates were instructed no longer to allow the people coming to worship at their churches to be deceived by vain figments and false documents as was habitual in most places.[1] The "vain figments" alluded to by the council are exemplified by the action of Honorius III., in 1225, when he revoked the indulgence of the church of Saracinesca because the priests there assured the people that through it they were stripped of their sins as completely as the bark had been removed from a peeled wand which they exhibited.[2]

No church could afford to be behind its competitors in attractions for pilgrims and their alms, and whatever one professed to have its rivals sought to procure or to outdo, by fair means or foul. We have seen (p. 149) the slender grants made to the English churches at the close of the thirteenth century, and yet we are told about 1300 that the clergy of Ely, being desirous of equalling those of Norwich, who had obtained an indulgence for Trinity Sunday, and those of Bury, who had one for the feast of St. Edmund, applied to the pope and secured a plenary for Trinity Sunday,[3] which was evidently a forgery. The same incentive made itself felt with tenfold force in Rome, where the churches were so numerous and the crowds of pilgrims so great, leading, at the close of the fourteenth century, to the vast aggregation of the most extravagant pardons, to which allusion has already been made (p. 279). The antiquity of these establishments, and the close relations which many of them bore to the curia, encouraged them to claim these grants as from early popes handed down by tradition, and as all were engaged in the work there was no one to gainsay them. As a general rule, all these frauds passed uncontested, but the papal wrath was aroused, when, in 1453, Nicholas V. heard of one, somewhat more audacious than usual, by which Alonso de Almarzo, abbot of the ancient house of Antealtaria, near

[1] C. Lateran. IV. ann. 1216, Cap. 62 (Cap. 14 Extra v. xxxviii.).
[2] Richardi de S. Germano Chron. ann. 1225 (Muratori, S. R. I. VII. 999).
[3] Amort de Indulg. I. 197.

Compostella, at the head of a company of sharpers, on the strength of forged and falsified papal letters, was engaged in selling throughout Spain and even in France, plenary indulgences and promises to release souls from purgatory. It was not much worse than the ordinary practices of the quæstuarii, but it was more conspicuous, and Nicholas promptly ordered the Archbishop of Tarragona to suppress these children of damnation.[1] At the same time it was rather expected that priests would commit similar frauds in the more restricted circles of their parish churches, for among the questions to be asked of them when in the confessional are whether they grant indulgences which they cannot give, or exaggerate those which their churches possess, or enter into collusion with pardoners for a share in the profits, all of which are mortal sins.[2] As for the pardoners, their frauds have already been alluded to (p. 286), and need not be repeated here. They were adepts in the art of falsification, and altered and enlarged their letters of indulgence without scruple.[3]

If the secular clergy were thus reckless in manufacturing indulgences to suit the market, the regulars were quite as active, though, as we have seen in the cases of the Portiuncula and the Carmelite scapular, they usually succeeded in obtaining from the Holy See confirmation of their inventions sooner or later. In this the Mendicant Orders were especially prominent. One device which they seem to have shared in common was that of alluring the people to their churches by the promise of indulgences which were conceded only to the members of the Orders, a fraud for which they were sharply reproved by Leo X., in 1519.[4] As to the two leading Mendicant Orders, the Franciscan and Dominican, there is no question that, from the time of their organization, they manifested their extreme utility to the Holy See and were largely favored by successive popes,

---

[1] Raynald. Annal. ann. 1453, n. 19.

[2] S. Antonini Confessionale, fol. 58*b*.

[3] Tertio in brevibus seu cartellis suis tot indulgentias fingunt et mentiuntur et male exponunt quæ fere nullus credit.—Humb. de Romanis de Tractandis in Concilio, P. III. Cap. 8 (Martene, Ampl. Collect. VII. 197).

[4] Leonis PP. X. Const. *Dudum*, 1519 (Bullar. I. 597). In the following pages I shall consider only the indulgences fabricated to attract the laity; these were unaffected by the reforms of Paul V. (p. 460), which were directed against those for members of the Orders.

but that favor did not exhibit itself in breaking through the moderation with which indulgences were conceded in the thirteenth century. The friars were quite content, as we have seen (p. 148), with grants of twenty or forty days to those visiting or aiding their churches, and there was unusual liberality in a grant by Boniface VIII., in 1299, to the Franciscan church of S. Maria della Pace in Bologna of one year and a quarantine for those visiting it on the feasts of the Virgin, and a hundred days on the feasts of Francis, Martin, Boniface, Benedict, and Mary Magdalen.[1] Yet the Franciscans claim to have nineteen bulls from popes of the thirteenth century, beginning with Gregory IX., in 1228, by which those visiting any of their churches, on any day of the year, could gain one year and three hundred and twenty days; on the feasts of the Virgin, three hundred and fifty-seven years, one hundred and twelve quarantines, and one hundred days, and others on numerous other feasts, running from forty to two or three hundred years. Authentic copies of these bulls were asserted to be preserved in the conveniently distant convent of Salamanca, and in 1530 Clement VII. confirmed all their claims. This is only a portion of the mass of forgeries in which the good brethren revelled, too large and intricate to be worth unravelling here, though we may mention those in which they stimulated the profitable superstition as to the benefit of dying and being buried in a Franciscan habit, for which they asserted that Clement IV., in 1265, remitted a third part of sins, Nicholas IV., in 1290, the same, and Urban V., in 1363, the same, while Alexander VI., in 1493, extended it to women.[2] One might think that these accumulated frauds, with the excessive indulgences subsequently showered upon them, would render superfluous any later eccentricities on the part of all connected with the Order, yet, in 1734, the attention of the Congregation of Indulgences was drawn to a summary issued by the Franciscan Royal Chapel of the Conception at Granada setting forth the virtues of the medals distributed at the chapel under indulgences granted by Leo X., and recently confirmed by the reigning pontiff, Clement XII., in 1733. This summary was prohibited as containing indulgences

[1] Digard, Registres de Boniface VIII. n. 3291. See p. 239 for the summary of Franciscan indulgences by John XXII. in 1330.

[2] Amort de Indulg. I. 156–7.—Raccolta di Indulgenze, pp. 207–11 (Camerino, 1803).

false, apocryphal, offensive to pious ears, scandalous, and injurious to the Holy See; the Procurator General was notified of the action and the pope was asked for a brief to the Ordinary of Granada, who was ordered to see to the destruction of all copies. Yet with the extraordinary persistence, which is one of the most noteworthy features of these frauds, the Congregation, twenty years later, in 1754, was obliged to repeat its action.[1] We have seen, moreover, how large were the graces bestowed on the Franciscan Tertiaries, and yet, in 1720, a summary which they had published in 1712 was interdicted under the penalties of the Index, as containing false, apocryphal, and revoked indulgences.[2]

The Dominicans were as enterprising as their rivals, the Franciscans, in this flagitious industry. From popes of the thirteenth century, beginning as early as Honorius III., they claimed to have six indulgences, each of twenty-five years and three quarantines, amounting in all to a hundred and fifty years and eighteen quarantines, for every one stretching forth a helping hand to their churches; seven of seven years each for giving them food and clothing, and forty-two for visiting their churches on certain feasts. Thus for the anniversary of the dedication, from Honorius III. to Boniface VIII., there are seven, aggregating a hundred and nineteen years and seven hundred and eighty days. The fictitious character of all this is self-evident, but if proof be wanting it is found in a grant by Paul IV., in 1558, offering ten years and quarantines for visiting a Dominican church on the feast of St. Dominic and praying for Catholic unity. In this there is no allusion to any prior indulgences, yet the Order claimed to have them for this feast from Gregory IX., Innocent IV., Alexander IV., Clement IV., John XXI., Nicholas IV., Boniface VIII., Benedict XI., Alexander V. and Sixtus IV., aggregating two hundred and forty-seven years and three hundred and thirty days.[3]

As for the chief sinners in this line, the Carmelites, I have already (pp. 257, 276) alluded to the monstrous list of spurious indulgences, from the ninth century onward, of which they procured the confirmation from Clement X., in 1673. In addition to these they claimed that under concessions from Honorius III. and Nicholas IV. there was a

[1] Decr. Authent. n. 76, 218.
[2] Decr. Authent. n. 41.
[3] Amort de Indulg. I. 147–8.

plenary for any one visiting one of their churches on any day of the year, and this was confirmed by the Congregation of Indulgences, March 22, 1678, although, as the Order was not confirmed until 1317 by John XXII., the spuriousness of the so-called grants was self-evident.[1] Yet the Carmelites could not content themselves with the enormous indulgences which they had manufactured for themselves and persistently claimed more. In 1667 their Book of Indulgences was placed on the Index of Alexander VII., and, in 1734, some enterprising members of the Order issued in Palermo another work, pronounced by the Congregation to contain false and apocryphal indulgences, and therefore prohibited under the penalties of the Index.[2] Their great confraternity of the Blessed Virgin of Mount Carmel also could not be satisfied with the vast indulgences attributed to the scapular, and their summary was condemned by the Congregation in 1668, and again in 1678, among a large number of others, as containing false, apocryphal and indiscreet indulgences.[3]

The fourth of the Mendicant Orders, the Augustinian Hermits, were similarly unscrupulous. Like that of Carmel, the Order was not confirmed until the fourteenth century, having barely escaped extinction at the council of Lyons in 1274, and being only allowed to exist on probation. Of course, all thirteenth century grants of indulgences to it are fictitious, yet it professes to have from Innocent IV. one of a thousand years and quarantines for visiting its churches from Septuagesima to Palm Sunday, with remission *a culpa et pœna* on Wednesday, Thursday, and Friday of Holy Week, and another from him of a thousand years and quarantines for extending a helping hand for repairs. Its Confraternity of the Cincturati claimed at least a dozen from popes of the thirteenth century, commencing with Gregory IX., and all these were confirmed by the complaisant Clement X. in 1675. Yet the confraternity could not be content with this, and its summary of indulgences was vainly condemned by the Congregation in 1668, in 1678, and again in 1712.[4]

---

[1] Serrada, Escudo del Carmelo, pp. 355, 360, 370.

[2] Index Innocentii XI. p. 172 (Romæ, 1681).—Decr. Authent. n. 88.

[3] Decr. Authent. n. 4, 14.

[4] Amort de Indulg. I. 139, 184–7.—Decr. Authent. n. 4, 14, 31.

The Teutonic Order was as unscrupulous as the rest. Two vernacular summaries of their indulgences, exposed in their churches for the information of

The venerable Benedictine Order had not the organization of the Mendicants; its establishments were largely autonomous or at most grouped into special congregations; no general indulgences were asked by them, and whatever frauds were committed were by individual monasteries for their own behoof, and have long since disappeared from view. One of their establishments, however, the house of Monserrat, claimed, in the seventeenth century, the privilege of distributing indulgenced medals, crosses and chaplets under a concession of Clement VIII. When they issued summaries advertising their wares these were condemned by the Holy See in 1635. The monks were incorrigible, however, and in 1727 the Congregation denounced, as a scandal to the faithful, a summary printed by them in Rome, in 1726, on account of the false indulgences which it offered.[1]

Among the branches of the Augustinians the Premonstratensians claimed a general indulgence which they said had been granted by sixteen archbishops and bishops of their Order, assembled in chapter, and that it had been confirmed by numerous popes of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. It is a curious agglomeration of years and carenas and days, for services rendered them or presence at their solemnities, wholly beyond the restricted concessions of the period.[2] The Servites do not seem to have indulged in the craze for fabricating ancient documents, but they could not restrain themselves within the limits of their real privileges, and no less than eleven summaries of their indulgences were put on the Index by Alexander VII. in 1667.[3] It was the same with the Order of Merced, whose summary was prohibited at the same time, *donec corrigatur*, while that of their confraternity was condemned in 1668 and 1678. Moreover, in 1602, they had been sharply rebuked by Clement VIII. for inviting the public to their churches with placards promising

---

the faithful and drawn up in 1466 and 1513, contain numerous extravagant concessions from popes of the thirteenth century, including a plenary from Honorius III. to all who would give them horses or weapons.—Dudík, Ueber Ablasstafeln, Wien, 1868.

[1] Amort, II. 48.—Decr. Authent. n. 16, 57.

[2] Amort de Indulg. I. 138.

[3] Index Innocent. XI. p. 172. There is no allusion to indulgences in a confirmation of the privileges of the Servites by Benedict XI. in 1304.—Schmidt, Päpstliche Urkunden u. Regesten, p. 53 (Halle, 1886).

indulgences which were strictly confined to members.[1] The Jesuits, fortunately for themselves, rose into prominence at a time when indulgences were so freely given to influential corporations that fraud was scarce worth its risk, especially as they could not claim the obscurity of antiquity. When removed from supervision, however, their missions in China exploited in the wildest manner the superstition of their converts. Some summaries of indulgences for the Confraternity of the Annunciation of Our Lady, printed in Chinese, Ann. XII. of the Emperor Yung Vin (1734) offered during Lent 154,000 years for every day, besides twenty-two plenaries for certain days and the liberation of seven souls. Another summary of the same confraternity, for the simple recitation with contrition of seven Paters and Aves in a church, promised indulgences of varying amounts on a hundred and thirteen days in the year, including ninety-two plenaries, and this was stated to have been granted by Gregory XIII. when Father Kastner went to Rome, and to have been confirmed by Clement XI. in 1705. Then there was another which granted the liberation of a soul every Wednesday and Sunday for the recitation of nine Aves and one Pater. Somewhat less extravagant was one which the pope was said to have recently granted whereby for hearing thirty-four masses, fasting thirty-four times, undergoing thirty-four mortifications, and performing thirty-four works of mercy, the devotee could liberate thirty-four souls and convert thirty-four sinners. Probably the good missionaries understood the kind of Christianity best suited to their converts, but it did not find favor with the home authorities, for when the attention of the Congregation was called to these summaries it forbade the Jesuits to circulate them under pain of *ipso facto* excommunication and the canonical penalties.[2]

To a great extent the forgeries and falsifications of the regular Orders were validated from time to time by the Holy See, and their excesses beyond these limits have been curbed by the Congregation during the past two centuries. Besides these there was the vast and inextricable mass of mingled true and false enjoyed by local shrines or

[1] Index Innocent. XI. pp. 169–70.—Decr. Authent. n. 4, 14.—Amort de Indulg. II. 45.

[2] Decr. Authent. n. 92.

circulating among the people in various shapes. No general regulations could reach these and sift out the genuine from the fraudulent. Yet in the counter-Reformation something had to be done to remove or diminish the scandal, and the only resource of the council of Trent was to throw the task upon the bishops and provincial councils, though it fatally crippled them by requiring them to refer these matters to the pope for decision.[1] Some sporadic attempts were made in a general way to investigate the local indulgences (p. 445), but there was no vigorous and concerted effort, such as was necessary to cleanse the Augean stable.[2] It was merely smoothing over the surface of the evil to decree, as did the council of Cambrai in 1565, that no new and unknown indulgences should be offered to the people until they had been approved by the Ordinary, and the priests should diligently warn their flocks not heedlessly to place faith in the indulgences hawked around or even printed in little books, which make extravagant promises for insufficient, vain and superstitious causes.[3] Nor was more effected when the council held at Mechlin, in 1570, to receive the council of Trent in the Low Countries, repeated the warning as to immoderate indulgences, even if printed *cum privilegio*, especially those promising protection from the sword, tempests, floods and pestilence or certain liberation from purgatory, as well as those affixed to certain masses and the recitation of a number of prayers[4]—rules which would eliminate the Carmelite scapular and half of the papal concessions in modern times.

Nothing of course was to be expected from perfunctory and half-hearted work, such as this, and at last the Holy See took up the matter, though it could do little save in cases that might be brought to its attention in the manner proposed at Trent, for, theoretically at least, the responsibility is considered to rest with the bishops.[5] The earliest list of indulgences declared apocryphal in Rome would seem to be in 1635, when fifteen were thus included in a placard displayed in the Vatican and copied by Father Mani-

[1] C. Trident. Sess. XXV. Contin. Decr. de Indulgentiis.

[2] Gröne (Der Ablass, p. 157) complains of the utter neglect in Germany of the Tridentine decree, nor are there elsewhere signs to be found of greater activity. See also Van Espen, Jur. Eccles. Univ. P. II. Tit. vii. Cap. 3, n. 16.

[3] C. Cameracens. ann. 1565, Tit. 22 (Harduin. X. 602).

[4] C. Mechlin. ann. 1670 Tit. VIII. (De Ram Synodicon Belgic. I. 107).

[5] Ferraris, s. v. *Indulgentia*, Art. IV. n. 31.

gart.[1] These consist of a miscellaneous assortment, mostly ascribed to various popes from John XXII. to Urban VIII., some local and others evidently intended to be hawked around. Another method was adopted, in 1667, by Alexander VII. in placing on the Index as prohibited books a number of printed indulgences or summaries of indulgences—the latter being issued by religious Orders or confraternities or by the churches of Rome.[2] Occasional efforts, such as these, were, however, manifestly inadequate to overcome the evil, which was keenly felt by pious men, and which was tending to bring all indulgences into disrepute through the audaciously absurd ones which were everywhere offered to the ignorant.[3] Some competent tribunal sitting in permanence and specially intrusted with the duty was required, and this was furnished in 1668, when Clement IX. created a commission of cardinals for the purpose, which, by a brief of July 6, 1669, was erected into the body known as the Congregation of Indulgences and Relics. To it was attributed authority to prohibit the printing of false, apocryphal and indiscreet indulgences, of examining those printed, and, after reference to the pope, of rejecting them by papal authority. On the elevation to the cardinalate of its first secretary, Ricci, in 1681, he was not replaced and the labors of the Congregation ceased until it was reorganized, in 1710, by Clement XI.[4] Since then this body has had the supervision of all matters connected with indulgences; it has no power to grant them, but under the rules of the Index no books of indulgences or summaries or fly-sheets can be printed without its licence.[5] The

[1] Amort de Indulg. II. 48–9. In this the date is given as 1620, but among the items is one of 1635, and the third on the list is referred to, in 1678, as having been included in the condemnations of 1635.—Decr. Auth. n. 16.

[2] Amort, II. 48. One of these however, "Fiscus Papalis sive Catalogus Indulgentiarum et Reliquiarum septem principalium Ecclesiarum Urbis Romæ" is probably a Protestant publication in ridicule of the system (Index Innoc. XI. p. 101).

[3] See the complaints of Father Manigart, in 1664, in his *Praxis Pastoralis* P. I. Cap. viii. n. 11 (Amort, II. 177).

[4] Clement. PP. IX. Const. *In ipsis Pontificatus* (Bullar. VI. 283).—Decr. Authent. n. 698.—Beringer, p. 82.—Bangen, Die Römische Curie, p. 247 (Münster, 1854).

[5] Decret. de Libb. Prohib. § III. n. 12. Cf. Decr. Authent. n. 90, 715. This rule is by no means universally observed. Bishop Bouvier's "Traité des Indulgences" went through ten editions without it. "The Golden Book of the

Congregation consists of as many cardinals as the pope may assign to the duty, with a secretary and a number of consultors, some of them selected from among competent theologians, while others are *ex officio*, such as the papal Sacristan, the Promotor Fidei etc., and all questions submitted to it are subjected to a mature and searching examination before a vote is taken.[1] The Cardinal-Prefect calls meetings of the Congregation only once or twice a year, when the accumulated questions are disposed of; the decisions are submitted to the pope, and, if approved by him, are published as the law of the Church.[2]

The commission or Congregation went promptly to work. April 10, 1668, it forbade the confessors of the church of S. Maria di Castello of Castro Villari from using a pretended brief of plenary jubilee indulgence from Pius IV.; a copy of the decree was ordered to be suspended in the sacristy of the church, and the Bishop of Cassano was instructed to enforce its observance. On July 3 a similar brief, in the hands of the Confraternity of St. Leonardo at Viterbo, was condemned.[3] These were mere local frauds, exposed during labors of a more general character, for by September 18th it had prepared a more comprehensive decree, to the effect that, observing the increase of false, apocryphal and indiscreet indulgences circulated among genuine ones, so that the judgment of the pious was deceived and men were frustrated in the hope of obtaining remission for their sins, it had with special diligence collected certain ones which it condemns. Then follows a list of thirty-two, together with the summaries of five of the principal confraternities.[4] This was a very partial sifting out of the mass, but, considering the perplexity of the task, it shows a commendable degree of zeal and activity on the

Confraternities," which for forty years has had an enormous circulation in the United States, bears only the approbation of Archbishop Hughes. The same is observable in several other little collections of indulgences for popular use which I have examined.

[1] Bangen, *op. cit.* p. 254. All the materials and arguments collected by the industry of the officials and consultors are printed and sent to the cardinals about a fortnight in advance of the meeting at which they are to be discussed. I have several of these, which show how intricate sometimes are the questions and how elaborate the preparation. One of them, on the subject of the privileged masses of St. Gregory, forms a volume of 176 large quarto pages.

[2] Cloquet, Archives de la S. C. des Indulgences, 1862, p. 3.

[3] Decr. Authent. n. 1, 3.

[4] Ibid. n. 4.

part of the Congregation. It continued its labors, and ten years later, in 1678, it issued another decree, reciting that fictitious and false indulgences are constantly reported to it, as well as others which have been revoked or have become void by the expiration of the time for which they were conceded. As the evil is daily increasing the Congregation has collected a number and has caused their insertion in the Index. The result scarce corresponds with the promise, for the list appended consists of those condemned in 1668, with only ten additions, though there is added the timely notice that it is not to be assumed that all indulgences not thus denounced as fictitious are to be tacitly assumed to be genuine.[1]

With this utterance terminated for the time the efforts of the Congregation to eliminate the apocryphal indulgences which were everywhere forced upon the attention of the faithful. In so far as they went its labors were useful, but they were wholly inadequate to the necessities of the situation. After its reorganization, in 1710, it occasionally condemned the frauds as they happened to be brought to its attention, but it apparently made no attempt to search for them, nor, as we shall see, were its decrees always effective in repressing those thus censured. In 1756 it took a further important step. Expressing regret that, in spite of its previous action as to the printing of indulgences, through malice or carelessness many abuses creep in, it renewed its former decrees on these points, and further decided that for the future no general indulgences should be valid unless those who obtained them should present them to its secretary.[2] This somewhat arbitrary action gave it a kind of supervisory power, but at the same time there was an evident necessity that if it was to perform its functions properly it must be able to preserve a record of all graces of this nature that might be issued. About the same time Benedict XIV., to assist bishops in the duty of distinguishing the genuine from the false, unofficially described a few tests, which have been repeated and multiplied, with more or less variation, by subsequent writers. It is interesting to observe that these admit that claims earlier than the eleventh century, and that those for prolonged terms prior to the fifteenth century, are doubtful and for the most part forged, while at the same time a discreet silence is observed as to the confirmation by the popes of the monstrous frauds

[1] Ibid. n. 14.

[2] Decr. Authent. n. 224.

of the religious Orders and the preposterous graces of the Roman churches. The test that the work must be proportioned to the indulgence, and that all are invalid which are based on trivial observances, loses sight entirely of the flood of pardons granted for ejaculations, a few Paters and Aves etc., while the rule which proscribes as fraudulent all which promise protection from temporal misfortune would exclude the Carmelite Scapular, the Benedictine medal, the miraculous medal of the Virgin, and all similar ones.[1] In fact, modern profusion has rendered impossible the detection of falsification from internal evidence, so long as the somewhat elastic limits prescribed to papal power are observed, although in grants claiming antiquity a comparison with the custom prevailing at the assumed date enables one to detect fraud or exaggeration. For general indulgences, accessible to all the faithful, the official Raccolta serves as a test, for it is presumed to contain all such, but beyond it lies the vast and heterogeneous mass of local indulgences and those bestowed on the religious Orders and Confraternities, as well as many indulgenced objects. In fact, in 1856, the Congregation confessed its helplessness with regard to weeding out the false from the true in the great number of fraudulent indulgences which, through heedlessness or malice, are constantly circulated among the faithful. A few of these brought to its notice it condemned; it also denounced as fictitious the innumerable indulgences promised in a tablet hung over the altar *del Perdon* in the cathedral of Mexico and those of the high altar of the church of the nuns of St. Bernard in the same city, but in a solemn audience with Pius IX. the pope, by a decree, *Urbis et Orbis*, was obliged to relegate the matter to the local bishops, exhorting them to use the utmost vigilance to prevent the hawking around of false and apocryphal indulgences, to suppress them in the hands of the faithful, and to enforce the decrees of the Congregation as to their printing. To assist them in this the only guidance suggested is a reference to the tests of Benedict XIV.[2] In view of this tacit admission it need not surprise us to learn that fraud and forgery are still busy everywhere; that the bishops neglect the duty im-

[1] Bened. PP. XIV. De Synodo Diœces XIII. xviii. 8, 9.—Binterim, Denkwürdigkeiten, V. III. 496–502.—Gröne, Der Ablass, pp. 135–6, 149–52.—Bouvier, pp. 89–90.—Beringer, pp. 103–6.

[2] Decr. Authent. n. 698, 699, 700.—Maurel und Schneider, Die Ablässe, p. 95.

posed on them, and that fictitious indulgences are freely printed and sold on which the ignorant rely with especial devotion. All recent writers earnestly warn the faithful against these deceptions, but evidently without much hope of success. The trade is apparently a profitable one and impossible of suppression.[1]

The persistent longevity of many of these frauds, in spite of repeated exposure and condemnation, is a curious illustration of the frame of mind induced among the people by the theory of indulgences taught them and the promises held out to them in those which are officially promulgated. When a peasant is told that a plenary can be had every month for the daily repetition of some brief ejaculation, he may be pardoned for believing that thousands of years will be gained by some equally simple pious observance, nor can he be expected to know that the papal sanction has been accorded to the one and withheld from the other. The printed prayer, with its image and list of indulgences attached, is sold for a few cents, and the seller, whether priest or peddler, is interested in keeping up the belief, which is pious when the article is genuine and only superstitious when it is fraudulent.

In the list of indulgences condemned in 1635 appear the crosses of Madre Luisa de Carrion. She was a Franciscan *beata* of extraordinary sanctity, to whom God had revealed that all who possessed crosses, beads, etc., blessed by her, were secure of salvation. These were circulated throughout Spain in immense numbers, and the Franciscans were reckoned to have cleared, during her long career, between the sale of these and the offerings of pilgrims, some two hundred thousand ducats. At length, in 1635, when she was seventy years old, the Inquisition arrested and prosecuted her, probably because she had ventured to interfere with Olivares, the all-powerful favorite of Philip IV. The surrender of all these blessed objects was ordered, and they were sent in almost by the cart-load; the Duke of Aerschot alone had no less than two thousand of the crosses.

[1] Raccolta, pp. xxix.–xxx.—Jouhanneaud, Dict. des Indulg. p. 158.—Gröne, Der Ablass, p. 157.—Bouvier, p. 92.—Beringer, pp. 99, 106.

"How often, especially in Italy, do we not come across men selling flying sheets with a prayer, and at the back the indication that Pope Clement or Benedict or John—which of the many popes bearing those names the paper does not say—granted for its recitation a plenary indulgence."—Lépicier, Indulgences, their Origin, Nature and Development, p. 291.

Yet the Congregation still considered it necessary to repeat its condemnation of them in 1668 and 1678.[1] Still more persistent is the so-called indulgenced object known as the Cross of Caravaca. This is a double-barred patriarchal cross with floreated ends, concerning which the legend relates that a pious missionary, eager to spread the faith, went to Caravaca in Murcia while it was under Saracen dominion. King Zeyt Abuzeyt cast him in prison and then commanded him to celebrate mass. He sent for the requisite vessels and vestments, but when he was about to commence, in the king's presence, he found that the cross, without which mass cannot be sung, had been forgotten. His difficulty was miraculously relieved by an angel who brought him one; the king, at the consecration, saw a beautiful child in his hands, and was converted. The cross was carried to Cuenca, where it worked many wonders and was highly venerated. When the devotion threatened to fall off, at the beginning of the eighteenth century, the Jesuit Román de Higuera revived it by producing among his other forgeries ancient documents showing that the angel, or angels, had taken the cross from the breast of St. Robert, Patriarch of Jerusalem, and that it was made of wood of the true cross. The Jesuits took it up and busied themselves with distributing little fac-similes which had touched it and consequently shared its virtues. These they even carried to Germany, where they worked many miracles.[2] To popularize the devotion indulgences were forged for it, and these were condemned by the Congregation in the lists of 1668 and 1678. This was of no avail, for in 1721 it had to proscribe a book printed in Germany containing indulgences asserted to have been granted to the cross of Caravaca by Pius V., Gregory XV., and Clement X., and recently confirmed by Innocent XII.—the pontificate of the latter being subsequent to the prior condemnations, thus rendering the forgery peculiarly audacious. Yet these repeated condemnations were of no avail, and the cross of Caracava is still

---

[1] Cartas de Jesuitas (Memorial Histórico Español, T. XIII.-XV.).—Amort de Indulg. II. 49.—Decr. Authent. n. 4, 14.

[2] Papebrochii Hist. et Mirac. Crucis Caravacanæ, Antverpiæ, 1684.

In an auto-de-fé at Toledo, in 1610, there was penanced with two hundred lashes and two years' exile Manuel de Mesones for asserting that adultery was not a sin. In his defence he alleged that he was very devoted to the cross of Caravaca, and offered it a Pater and Ave every time he saw it.—MSS. Königl. Univ. Bibl. Halle, YC. 20, Tom. I.

enumerated among the fictitious indulgenced objects circulated among the faithful in France.[1] Among the condemnations in 1668 and 1678 was one of an indulgence for reciting an Ave at the sound of the clock. This is evidently the same as one representing Nuestra Señora del Pilár, and promising 9020 days for doing so, and adding "Praised be the hour when Our Lady came in the flesh to Saragossa," a fac-simile of which, with the date of 1812, will be found in the Appendix.[2] In the earliest list of condemnations, in 1635, are to be found the Ave Maria beads of Juan de la Cruz, said to have been touched by one of three beads which are in possession respectively of the pope, the King of Spain, and the General of the Observantine Franciscans. This condemnation was repeated in 1668 and 1678, yet Bishop Bouvier includes these beads among the fictitious indulgences which he says are most popular in France.[3] One of the most notorious of these frauds is that known as the measure of the Virgin's foot, asserted to have been conceded by John XXII. Although it is included in all the lists of condemned indulgences for the past two hundred years, it still is largely circulated in France; in Spain it is sold for twenty céntimos (four cents) by the priests of the church of N. Señora de la Soledad in Madrid, and I presume elsewhere, though, of course, they are aware of its being forbidden, and their bishop takes no step to suppress the traffic. From a fac-simile in the Appendix it will be seen that a *toties quoties* indulgence of three hundred years, granted by John XXII. and confirmed by Clement VIII. in 1603, is obtainable on the easy terms of kissing it thrice and saying three Aves. The sandal from which the measure is taken is asserted to be preserved with great veneration in a Spanish monastery. Similar frauds are the measure of the height of Christ,

[1] Decr. Authent. n. 4, 14, 44.—Jouhanneaud, Dict. des Indulgences, p. 158. As a good Jesuit, Father Beringer (Die Ablässe, p. 100) declares the miraculous origin of the cross to be indubitable, though he admits that the indulgences connected with it have been condemned.

[2] Decr. Authent. n. 4, 14. The legend relates that when St. James the Apostle was in Saragossa, the Virgin appeared to him, standing on a pillar of jasper, and ordered a church to be built for her on that spot, resulting in the first church erected anywhere in her honor.—Aguirre, Con. Hispan. I. 152.—Morales, Coronica General de España, IV. 345, 395.—In the Chronicle of the Pseudo-Dexter, ann. 37, with Francisco de Bivar's commentary (Migne, XXXI. 131) will be found ample details of the authenticity of the legend.

[3] Amort de Indulg. II. 48.—Decr. Authent. n. 4, 14.—Bouvier, p. 91.

FICTITIOUS INDULGENCE FOR PRAYER AT THE SOUND OF THE CLOCK.

(*See page* 566, *Vol. III.*)

Rezando una Ave María, quando da el reloxo, y diciendo: Alabada sea la hora, en que N. Señora vino en carne mortal à Zaragoza; se ganan 9020. dias de indulgencia: y 8120. quantas veces se repita con dicha alabanza ante esta santa Imágen.
B. T. F. 1812.

the measure of the wounds in his side, and others, which no condemnation seems to deprive of the confidence of the faithful.[1]

Yet it is not only by conscious fraud that the faithful are deceived. The Abbé Cloquet, after mentioning one or two gross cases of fictitious indulgences current in France, points out that innumerable others, especially those connected with confraternities, are invalid in consequence of the inobservance of minute details in the prescribed formalities. Scarce any care, he assures us, will suffice to escape error, for even the officials of the Congregation of Indulgences will sometimes ignorantly give incorrect responses to inquirers, and the popular manuals of indulgences, as well as the summaries circulated by the religious Orders, by their blunders and false promises frequently mislead the devotee. The only mode of obtaining certainty is by personal inspection of the original grants and decisions preserved in the archives of the Congregation.[2]

There is one question connected with fictitious indulgences which has been variously debated—whether they are valid to those who gain them in ignorant good faith. There is a distinction drawn between the conscious fraud that forges and issues those known to be false, which no belief on the part of the recipient can make good, and those which have expired by their own limitation, or have been revoked, or have been published by prelates unknowingly exceeding their authority. When in the earlier time local indulgences were rarely perpetual, but were issued for terms of three or five or ten years, the priests who profited by them, if unable to secure a renewal, would not be apt to proclaim the fact, but would rather allow the faithful to continue to win them, and there must have been a shade of doubt over a large proportion of these privileges.[3] It was important to reassure the people as to the genuineness of the pardons, but the doctors were not wholly in accord. Stefano Notti puts the case

[1] Amort *loc. cit.*—Decr. Authent. n. 4, 14.—Bouvier, p. 92.—Jouhanneaud, Dict. des Indulgences, p. 158.

[2] Cloquet, Archives de la S. C. des Indulgences, 1862, Ch. II. III.

[3] In 1581 the council of Rouen complains that in the cathedrals old indulgences which have expired or have been revoked continue to be published as valid, and it asks that they be renewed, as they are necessary to attract the people to attend the services of Easter and Pentecost.—C. Rotomag. ann. 1581, De Episc. Officiis n. 36 (Harduin. X. 1234).

whether a man gains an indulgence who, under probable error, visits a church where he mistakenly thinks there is an indulgence and gives alms, or where an indulgence has been conceded by one believing himself to have the power but really not having it. He does not venture to decide it, but says that Zabarella thinks the indulgence is gained, for God looks at the heart, but others hold that it is not.[1] As for revoked indulgences it is the common opinion that the revocation does not take effect until those who enjoy them are notified of the fact, for they have the benefit of invincible ignorance.[2] In the middle of the last century Serrada explains the little confidence felt in indulgences as arising, not from heretical disbelief in their efficacy, but from the uncertainty as to their being properly granted, or doubts as to their being suspended or revoked,[3] and the French bishops, in their remonstrance of 1869, assume, as we have seen, that a large portion of the faithful, through no fault of their own, fail to obtain the indulgences which they imagine themselves to gain.[4] These are difficulties inherent in the system, and their eradication would seem to be impossible.

---

[1] Steph. ex Nottis Opus Remissionis fol. 155*a*.

[2] Escobar, Theol. Moral. Tract. VII. Cap. 6.—Amort de Indulg. II. 187.

[3] Serrada, Escudo del Carmelo, p. 338.

[4] Concil. Collect. Lacens. VII. 844.

CHAPTER XV.

INFLUENCE OF INDULGENCES.

It is a calumny, we are told, to assert that indulgences lead to laxity in morals and discipline. On the contrary, they are a useful stimulus to repentance and amendment, for these are indispensable conditions for winning them, and experience, it is asserted, shows that those who are most eager to gain them lead more earnest and more conscientious lives than the indifferent.[1] A more emotional and spiritual writer takes a different view of their utility, and sums up their benefits thus: They lead to a proper recognition and appreciation of the sufferings of the saints and of Christ. They foster the spirit of prayer and keep alive faith in the Presence of God; it is no argument against this that the prayers are uttered with the motive of avoiding just punishment, for nine-tenths of the faithful only pray to obtain some favor. They are a potent means to keep alive in us a wholesome fear of God and appreciation of the terrors of purgatory. But "The apex of the perfection of indulgences and the highest standpoint from which it behooves us to judge of their worth" is their stimulation of charity by enabling us to rescue the souls of our suffering brethren in purgatory.[2] Father Lépicier, who thus regards them as powerful adjuvants in the spiritual development of the faithful, has apparently no belief in them as a force making for righteousness, for he admits that they are a concession to the diminished faith and charity of modern times; it is so much more difficult to resist the assaults of the tempter now than it was of old that the Church has wisely multiplied the means of obtaining remission from the *pœna* even as she has multiplied the means of obtaining in the sacrament remission from the *culpa*.[3] When two orthodox and experienced authorities thus differ; when one holds indulgences to be the means of amending the sinner, while the other virtually regards them as a means of enabling him to escape punish-

[1] Beringer, pp. 47–8.
[2] Lépicier, Indulgences, pp. 347–52.
[3] Ibid. pp. 346–7.

ment without amendment, it would perhaps be hazardous for those without experience to formulate a mere *a priori* opinion, and we must look for guidance to the testimony of men who watched with all-absorbing interest the gradual development of the system.

When the lapsed, in the Decian persecution, clamored for reconciliation without undergoing the prescribed course of penance, the Roman clergy emphatically supported Cyprian in his efforts to withstand the pressure: to cover up the wound, they said, without allowing remedial penitence to close it, is not to cure but to slay the patient.[1] This, however, represents opinion at a time long anterior to the invention of the sacrament of penitence and the discovery of the treasure, when the sinner had to settle his account with God, and the Church could not cleanse him with absolution or offer from the sufferings of Christ an equivalent for the penalties incurred. When this system had become organized it was not long before its results aroused inquietude. In 1253 we learn that there was a custom of requiring ecclesiastics to swear that they would not endeavor to obtain indulgences or use them when obtained;[2] apparently prelates, who were quite satisfied that laymen should purchase and enjoy indulgences, had found reason to dread their effects upon the clergy, and imposed such a condition when conferring preferment, nor, derogatory though it was to the beneficent influence of the treasure, is this the only instance of such caution, as we shall see hereafter. When, in 1274, the council of Salzburg adopted the heroic expedient of suspending all indulgences, it gave as a reason the enervation of discipline which experience showed that they occasioned in many places.[3] Perhaps even more damaging than this is the naïve admission embodied in an argument frequently used in their favor—that they are particularly useful to those who are apt to relapse into sin, and would not be likely to abstain from it during the term of pen-

[1] Ubi enim poterit indulgentiæ medicina procedere si etiam ipse medicus, intercepta pœnitentia, indulget periculis? si tantummodo operit vulnus nec sinit necessaria temporis remedia obducere cicatricem? Hoc non est curare, sed si dicere verum volumus, occidere.—Cypriani Epist. 30 (Ed. Oxon.).

[2] In a crusading bull of 1253, Innocent IV. insists that clerics shall be allowed to go notwithstanding "quod ipsorum aliqui de non impetrandis aliquibus indulgentiis vel non utendis impetratis aut concessis juramento præstito promiserint."—Ripoll I. 232.

[3] C. Salisburgens. ann. 1274, Cap. 6 (Dalham Concil. Salisburg. p. 119).

ance from which an indulgence relieves them, for penance to be effective must be performed in a state of grace.[1] Thus they released the sinner from restraint, and encouraged his evil tendencies by teaching him that prompt admission to heaven could be purchased without mending his ways. Cardinal Caietano takes virtually the same view when he says that indulgences satisfy, but are not medicinal like penance; they do not make a man good, and he has no merit from them, but he only pays for the punishment which he would satisfy by penance.[2] When Ambrogio Catarino undertook to reply to the Lutheran argument that indulgences made men indifferent to the performance of good works, he admitted it by saying that this arose from the malice of those who abuse the goodness and liberality of God[3]—this malice apparently being no impediment to the enjoyment of the pardon. Even more significant of demoralization is the admission made by Azpilcueta in his argument to prove that sins committed in expectation of an indulgence are none the less entitled to it. We Catholics, he says, all commit sins which we would not do but for the assurance of pardon through penance, and the hope of impunity does not deprive the sinner of the benefit of the law.[4] The natural result of this is seen in the utterances of some of the French councils held to introduce the decrees of Trent. That of Tours, in 1583, complains of the immunity accorded to simony by the plenary indulgences under which simoniacs are absolved without making restitution, and that of Toulouse, in 1590, deplores that what is of supreme utility may be so perverted by the wicked as to cause great evils; indulgences are salutary, but human malice abuses them.[5] St. Pius V., in 1570, when condemning the action of the Spanish bishops (p. 426), describes the demoralizing influence of profuse and indiscreet indulgences with a vigor worthy of a Protestant, although the profusion and indiscretion which he assailed were less than is habitual at the present day.

[1] S. Antonini Summæ P. I. Tit. X. Cap. 3, § 3.

[2] Caietani Opusc. Tract. VIII. De Indulg. Q. 2.

[3] "Secundo arguunt quod ex hoc sequitur quod capientes indulgentias fiunt secordes ad bona opera, indulgentiis confidentes. Respondetur hoc esse ex eorum malitia qui liberalitate ac bonitate Dei abutuntur."—Ambr. Catarini adv. Lutheri Dogmata Lib. III. (Florentiæ, 1520, fol. 75*b*).

[4] Azpilcuetæ de Jubilæo Notab. XXXIV. § 6.

[5] C. Turonens. ann. 1583, Cap. 5; C. Tolosan. ann. 1590, P. II. Cap. 12 (Harduin. X. 1398, 1863).

Pius was justified in this position by the exhortation of the council of Trent to return to the ancient moderation lest the discipline of the Church should be relaxed by too great facility.[1] Fra Paolo takes advantage of this to point out that it implies an admission that indulgences do not affect the conscience or liberate from anything, but only touch ecclesiastical discipline.[2] In answering this Cardinal Pallavicino enters into an elaborate justification of the increasing laxity which so contemptuously disregarded the Tridentine decree. He admits that anciently the use of indulgences was restricted, but in ordering a recurrence to this the council did not mean to place a limit on what might be demanded by changing times and conditions. It being impossible now to enforce the canonical penances, indulgences afford a pleasant and efficacious aid to lead men to pious observances and to satisfy God by pious works. Besides, as the gaining of an indulgence is always uncertain, the stimulus remains to acquire certainty by other works, while those enjoined by the indulgence train men in the practice, as has been found by experience. Moreover, plenary indulgences render easy the otherwise most anxious labors of the confessor, who hesitates between imposing penance inadequate to the sins and the alternative of deterring the weakness of penitents from seeking the sacrament. It would be most troublesome for confessors if they always had to enquire closely whether the sinner was ready to accept a penance fitting for his sins. For these reasons the popes have been led to grant indulgences more liberally than the ancient custom permitted, and all doubt is removed as to the intention of the Tridentine fathers in their decree.[3] Read between the lines, this extraordinary apology admits that the whole penitential system of the Church had broken down; that in grasping superhuman powers it had been unable to find either confessors fit to discharge the awful responsibilities thrust upon them or penitents willing to endure the burdens which it had taught to be indispensable as satisfaction for their sins. Consequently the device of indulgences had been found necessary for the relief of both confessor and penitent; the prudent economy prescribed at Trent was impossible, and the reckless laxity of their distribution could only be defended by

[1] C. Trident. Sess. xxv. Contin. Decr. de Indulgentiis.

[2] Sarpi, Hist. del Con. Trident. Lib. viii. (Opp. Ed. Helmstat. I. 412).

[3] Pallavicini Hist. Con. Trident. Lib. xxiv. Cap. xii. § 6.

arguing that, as men did not place full faith in their promises, they do not work as much evil as they otherwise would. Bianchi, in justifying the profusion of plenaries for trivial observances, follows the same general line of thought, which is virtually identical with that quoted above from Lépicier—that those most in need of pardon might not be deterred from obtaining it, and that, in the increasing wickedness of the world, the popes have shown their wisdom and tenderness by facilitating repentance.[1]

What the experience of shrewd practical men, who had no illusions, taught as to the result of this tenderness, when they had no occasion to humor the beliefs of the faithful, is seen in the restrictions laid upon obtaining indulgences by the rules of some of the religious Orders. If indulgences were so efficient a means of grace as the theologians assure us, the monk and the friar should be stimulated to win on every occasion the multitudinous ones showered upon them by successive pontiffs. In the cruzada indulgence of 1564 there was a clause permitting religious to gain it without requiring the permission of their superiors, but in subsequent issues this was withdrawn, and Rodriguez lays it down as a general rule that such permission is necessary, experience having doubtless shown that monastic discipline was apt to suffer by too great a facility in obtaining pardons.[2] The Jesuits who, as we have seen, made ample use of the confessional in the internal government of the Society, objected strongly to the privileges attached to the cruzada and jubilee of selecting confessors and obtaining absolution for reserved cases. As early as 1581 they procured from Gregory XIII. a brief forbidding any Jesuit from availing himself of these concessions: apparently it was difficult of enforcement, and in 1595 Clement VIII. was induced to confirm it in the most absolute form. This was repeated by Gregory XV. and finally, in 1629, Urban VIII. emphatically declared that the privilege of choosing confessors was most pernicious in the religious Orders, wherefore he commanded that the faculties of the cruzada to that effect and to absolve for reserved cases should not be used by their members.[3] Unfortunately he did not pause to explain why

[1] Bianchi, Foriero dell' Anno Santo, pp. 46–9.

[2] Rodriguez, Della Bolla della S. Crociata, pp. 14, 251.

[3] Litt. Apostol. Soc. Jesu, p. 295 (Antverpiæ, 1635); Compendium Privilegiorum s. v. *Gratiarum Usus.*—Urbani PP. VIII. Const. *Romanus Pontifex* (Bullar. V. 183).

that which was so beneficial to the graceless laity should be so injurious to these holy men.

Miguel Medina ascribes to indulgences the function of having prevented Christianity from being a failure, for all zeal for virtue would have been lost in the deluge of vice had not the divine clemency furnished their sacred allurements to entice our infirmity; prayer and all other Christian customs would have disappeared but for the pardons conceded to rosaries and chaplets.[1] This admission of the failure of the Church in its mission to make men righteous is not accepted by Bellarmine, who says that it is safer and more profitable to satisfy with penance than to rely on indulgences, but better still to do both—to perform the penance and obtain the indulgence—as a traveller can make his journey better with two feet than with one,[2] but this reduces the influence of indulgences to the lowest point, as it renders them merely works of supererogation. It moreover implies an evident recognition that the doctrine generally taught of their substitution for penance is injurious in its effect, and the same may be traced in the celebrated Mandement of Fénelon for the jubilee of 1707 and the Instruction of Massillon for that of 1726. Both of these admirable teachers seek to minimize the evil tendencies of the system by assuming that it lifts no burden from the sinner, who must bear his cross and follow Christ; he must do all that he can, and it is only such deficiency as is inevitable from human imperfection that the Church can make up; those gain nothing who regard the indulgence as relieving them from penance and as assuring immunity for sin.[3] Were such sentiments generally diffused among the people little harm could arise from indulgences, but assuredly they would be sought with much less eagerness, nor would there be occasion for the complaints of their abuse, which are found in so many Catholic writers. Juenin declares that nothing is more injurious than the granting of indiscreet and superfluous indulgences.[4] Mohr asserts that good orthodox writers object to indulgences because they lead to excessive licence of life and unjust and unlawful

[1] M. Medinæ Disputat. de Indulg. Cap. XLVIII.

[2] Bellarmin. de Indulg. Lib. I. Cap. 10.

[3] Fénelon, Œuvres, Paris, 1838, T. II. p. 454.—Jouhanneaud, Dict. des Indulg. pp. 170–81.

[4] Juenin de Sacramentis Diss. XIII. Q. iii. Cap. 2.

dealings.[1] Bianchi admits that there are those who say that they encourage vice, but he argues that it is not their use but their abuse that does so; as to their multiplication, which is objected to, it is the multiplication of sins that has forced the popes to facilitate the remission of punishment.[2] Muratori consoles himself for the wagon-loads of indulgences which overspread the Church, which have extinguished penance and loosen the reins to sinners who can with such facile observances escape the punishment due to innumerable crimes —he consoles himself with the reflection that they have at least replaced the still more censurable custom of the redemption of penance, and thus the confessional is relieved from even the shadow of filthy gain.[3] There was evidently not much reason to hope that the constant outflow of indulgences would be checked, for when Vicenzo Palmieri argued that the power granted to the Church to issue them implied the obligation to use the power discreetly, his antagonist bravely replied that the power of the keys is of divine institution, but not its exercise, whether well or ill. Absolution is infallible for those properly disposed, but its bestowal is subject to a thousand errors on the part of the minister. Then, as if this were not a sufficient arraignment of the divine wisdom in framing such a system, he proceeds with the fatal question, How many errors may happen, and in fact too often do happen, through the ignorance or the dissoluteness possible in any confessor?[4] Evidently the Church is not to be held responsible for the abuse of its powers in any direction.

Doubtless Cardinal Wiseman is correct in his glowing description of the spiritual exaltation which he witnessed in Rome at the jubilee of 1825—of the eagerness with which the prescribed works were performed and the conversion of sinners in the contagious hypnotism of enthusiastic multitudes.[5] Even admitting, what we have no means

[1] Mohr Portiuncula Theologica p. 5 (Salisburgi, 1670).

[2] Bianchi, Foriero dell' Anno Santo, pp. 240–1.

[3] Muratori Antiq. Ital. Diss. 68 (T. XIV. pp. 113–14).

[4] Instruzione per un' Anima fedele, p. 101.

[5] "I wish you could have seen, not merely the churches filled, but the public places and squares crowded to hear the word of God—for churches could not contain the audience; I wish you could have seen the throng at every confessional and the multitudes that pressed round the altar of God to partake of

of knowing, that in many cases the good effects may have been more permanent than is customary with influences begotten of temporary excitement, the cardinal could only look upon the surface and could not know what might be going on beneath it. The general testimony would seem to be adverse to the collection of promiscuous crowds of both sexes on occasions like this, though no doubt the increasing refinement of modern manners may prevent the more open scandals, which have long been deplored. Felix Hemmerlin, in anticipation of the jubilee of 1450, wrote a pæan of rejoicing to urge the faithful to take advantage properly of the opportunity, but his experience gained by participating in the pilgrimage led him to utter a palinode, in which he reviewed the evil deeds of Boniface VIII., to prove that nothing good could spring from such a source, and that its sole object was to gather money. Female virtue suffered especially; of the multitudes who poured in upon the holy city not one in a hundred really gained the indulgence; few were saved, and an infinite number were injured, spiritually and temporally, and those who were saved could have done as well at home; the sinners who returned continued to sin as callously as of old, and no one thought of making restitution of ill-gotten gains.[1] Apparently the only result was to harden them in their evil courses by the promise of immunity, which they thought they had secured. Of course plain speaking, such as this, is rarely to be looked for, especially since the Reformation has placed the Church on the defensive, but, in 1700, Bianchi deprecates the custom of those who procure annual indulgences for the titular feasts of their churches and oratories, for they are solemnized with a promiscuous ball and admittance at a fixed price; such priests, he says, are guilty before God of all the drunkenness and obscenity which are committed in such a crowd through thoughts, words and acts.[2] Towards the close of the century, in

---

its heavenly gift. I wish you could know the restitution of ill-gotten property which was made and the destruction of immoral and irreligious books which took place, the amendments of hardened sinners which date from that time, and thus you would understand why men and women undertook the toilsome pilgrimage, and judge whether it was indulgence in crime and facility to commit sin that is proffered and accepted in such an institution."—Lépicier, Indulgences etc. p. 356.

[1] Hemmerlin Dyalogus de anno jubileo; Recapitulatio de anno jubileo.

[2] Bianchi, Foriero dell' Anno Santo, p. 218.

1778, Onofri describes the mobs which fill the churches on the occasion of indulgences, and exclaims "Oh, how much better would it be for them not to go there! The tablet suspended over the door, 'Plenary indulgences and remission of all sins,' would be truer if it read 'Plenary permission to commit all sins,' for on such occasions great is the abuse of the foolish people. Youths assemble there with arms, women with vanity, men with arrogance; there is music and dancing; quarrels arise, passions are excited, there is slaughter of souls, if in no other way, at least with words, with looks, with sneers, with desires. Is this the way to gain indulgences, to satisfy for sins? Rather is it the way to call down the lightning of heaven!" Nor were these scandals of recent origin, for he relates a case occurring in 1611, when on such an occasion at the Sanctuary of Monte Vergine, near Naples, a great crowd assembled, as usual, which kept up dancing through most of the night and committed horrible wickedness. The Virgin was so scandalized that she descended from heaven with a torch in either hand and set fire to the building erected for the reception of the pilgrims, when fifteen hundred of them perished in the flames or by falling walls, and five of those who escaped swore that they saw her come and apply her torches to the structure.[1] These disorders have not been confined to Italy. In 1782 Archbishop Colloredo of Salzburg ordered his priests to use every effort to prevent the scandals which frequently accompany occasions of obtaining indulgences. Crowds come from distant places, abandoning their duties and idling through many days, passing the nights crowded together without distinction of sex; they rush to the confessional without contrition and distract the confessor, who cannot ascertain the disposition of the penitent or discharge his triple duties of judge, teacher and physician of souls. Then the people pass in confusion to take communion, they recite the prayers for the indulgence, and, rejoiced at obtaining it, they hasten to have a good time in the taverns, and finally return home, believing themselves reconciled to God and able to abandon themselves to their old sins, for which they will subsequently again have so efficacious a remedy.[2]

We may reasonably hope that with improved facilities of trans-

[1] Onofri, Spiegazione della S. Crociata, pp. 195, 197.

[2] Atti e Decreti del Concilio di Pistoja, Append. VIII. p. 41. There is an abstract of this Pastoral in Dalham, Concil. Salisburg. p. 653.

portation many of these evils have diminished, and that the multiplication of plenaries, so easily acquired by a few prayers, has had the beneficial effect of checking pilgrimages for stated anniversaries. More serious, however, is Colloredo's assertion that with the mass of the people the obtaining of an indulgence is a mere formal transaction in which the heart and conscience have little part, and in which the clearing off of the old score is regarded as affording the opportunity of running up a new one. To what extent this habit of thought pervades the whole Catholic population it would of course be impossible to say. Among the educated and cultured classes, among those who are trained to think, there must be many who understand and accept the theory of the Church that indulgences are only effective to those who win them through repentance and amendment. Yet even with these it must be a matter of course that what suffices to obtain absolution suffices to win the indulgence that follows, and we have seen how the definition of sufficing servile attrition and intention to abandon sin have been attenuated to the utmost in order to admit as many as possible to the benefit of the sacrament of penitence. Among the ignorant and uncultured masses it is fair to assume that the indulgence is regarded as a sort of magic formula or conjuration through which the Church, in the exercise of the power of the keys, relieves them of the punishment due to their sins. Were it otherwise there would not be a paying demand for the fictitious printed indulgences hawked around, which promise partials and plenaries profusely without condition of penitence or amendment. A belief in such supernatural interference to preserve the sinner from the consequences of his sins cannot but exercise an unfortunate influence over the moral standard of those who entertain it. In fact, as we have seen (p. 51), Father Hörmann deplores that in the prevailing ignorance indulgences corrupt morals instead of elevating them.

Catholic controversialists in replying to Protestant strictures as to this are in the habit of employing the *tu quoque* argument that Protestantism is even more lax, for it holds out the promise of salvation and direct access to heaven without requiring the performance of any penances or any pious works.[1] This overlooks the essential

[1] "If in some of her Indulgences the Roman Church is said by them to sell these Pardons of Temporal Punishments very cheap, the Protestants give

difference that in Protestantism the sinner is required to deal directly with his God; he is relieved of no responsibility, and feels that he must adjust for himself, so long as life lasts, the repentance and the striving for amendment that may win justification from the mercy of his Creator.[1] To the Catholic, on the other hand, the Church is an intermediary gifted with supernatural powers, through which it can supplement his deficiencies and assure him of forgiveness whenever he chooses to invoke its services. In theory, it is true, the *Ego te absolvo* and the promises of the indulgence are dependent upon the disposition of the penitent, but in practice, as the denunciations of the "scrupulous" or doubting penitent show, entire reliance on these promises is expected, and the fullest faith in the supernatural agency which grants them. Such a periodical squaring of accounts with God through his minister, and such a release from all the consequences of sin, in return for performances that cost so little, can hardly fail to blunt the conception of the heinousness of offending God, of man's responsibility for his acts, and the dread of future punishment—in fact, of all the sanctions through which religion is expected to influence human conduct.

In preparation for the jubilee of 1700 Innocent XII. issued a declaration drawn up by a congregation of cardinals appointed for the purpose. This authoritative document sets forth clearly the official view of the advantages of indulgences, in ordering the faithful to be instructed as to the benefit to be derived from the jubilee, namely, that by its virtue and operation are remitted the punishments which man owes to divine justice, provided condign satisfaction coöperates with divine grace. Let the people, therefore, be taught that although by the sacrament of penance the guilt and eternal punishment are remitted, there nevertheless remains the debt of the temporal punishment and so heavy a burden of satisfaction that it requires copious almsgiving, rigorous fasting and long and

---

them to all for nothing."—The Roman Doctrine of Repentance and of Indulgences Vindicated from Dr. Stillingfleet's Misrepresentations, p. 44 (London, 1672).

[1] It is not easy to follow the chain of thought which leads to such an argument in defence of indulgences as this—"If we abolish Pardons or Indulgences we must take away also the existence of good and penitential works, and place man under the necessity of doing good or of doing evil without his being responsible for it."—Lépicier, Indulgences, p. 317.

difficult works of penance, as in the time of fervid Christians appears from the penitential canons, or else it must be paid by the horrid pains of purgatory. But as these are too severe for human infirmity, therefore the Vicar of Christ diminishes these satisfactions by indulgences.[1] If the two centuries which have elapsed since this have seen the rapid growth of the laxity wherewith the "condign satisfaction coöperating with divine grace" has been reduced to a minimum, it only emphasizes the relative positions here set forth between God, man and the Church. The relations between God and man are materialized and rendered antagonistic. God is a creditor whose claims are to be satisfied. The means of paying the debt are supplied by the pope and the priest, to whose bounty the sinner is indebted if he escapes the tortures of purgatory. The system infers that a debtor and creditor account is kept with every man; all his sins are charged to him, and he must settle for them by internal or external works or by purgatorial suffering. In the grosser ages of superstition and corruption this was largely accomplished by money payments, the treasure of the Church being distributed in exchange for current coin. Except in Spain this to a great degree ceased when the revolt of northern Europe rendered the counter-Reformation imperative if the Church should retain the veneration of its subjects, but the material view of the relations between man and his Creator has continued; the penitent sins and pays for his sin with a constantly diminishing amount of prayer—the diminution being ascribed not to the greater mercy of God, but to the liberality of the pope in dispensing the treasure and to the steadily increasing tepidity of the faithful which renders such allurement necessary. The ancient systems of penance have broken down and have been abandoned; austerities and mortifications and pilgrimages have

[1] Amort, II. 239. "Proponatur fidelibus utilitas quam ex magna hac indulgentia consequuntur; qualiter videlicet illius virtute ac operatione remittantur illæ pœnæ quas homo divinæ justitiæ debet, modo divina gratia condigna satisfactione cooperetur; doceatur ergo populus quod, licet per sacramentum pœnitentiæ culpa et æterna pœna remittatur, nihilominus post remissionem delictorum debitum temporalis pœnæ, adeoque grave onus satisfactionis remaneat, quod copiosis eleemosynis, rigorosis jejuniis et longis ac difficilibus operibus pœnitentiæ, ut tempore veterum fervidorum Christianorum factum esse liquet ex canonibus pœnitentialibus, aut horrendis pœnis purgatorii solvi deberet; cum vero talia sufferre humanæ infirmitati nimis grave foret, ideo Vicarius Christi tales satisfactiones per indulgentias minuit."

played a constantly diminishing part in spiritual penology; visiting churches, prayers and ejaculations have taken their place. Thus the exercises of religion tend to lose their character of a joyful and spontaneous expression of love and veneration for God, and to become, on the one hand, punishments to be endured in expiation, or, on the other, magic formulas by which the favor of God is coerced, like the ancient Brahmanic sacrifice of the Asvamedha whereby the gods were subjected to human will.

The influence of indulgences, however, has not been confined to morals, but has made itself felt, at times emphatically, on history. In the ages prior to the Reformation they were among the most potent agencies—perhaps the most potent—in furnishing the Church with ready money. While doubtless in many cases this encouraged the dissoluteness which was the standing reproach of the priesthood, a large portion of the funds thus obtained was expended on the external manifestation of religious feeling. The stately structures in which the devotion of our fathers displayed itself could scarce have been erected save through the means supplied by the sale of pardons, and the arts, which found in the Church their most munificent patron, were thus stimulated to a development earlier and greater than could have taken place without such adventitious assistance. The glories of Nôtre Dame, of Reims, of Cologne, and of St. Peter's exhibit to us in concrete form the results of the labors of successive generations of quæstuarii, gathering from the people what they were willing to pay for the remission of their sins, and modern art has reason to be grateful for the impulse thus originated and steadily maintained through centuries.

In the arena of politics indulgences played an even more important part. The dominating fact in medieval history is the struggle for supremacy between the spiritual and temporal powers. The former had many weapons with which to withstand or assail the brute force of the latter, but among them not the least efficient was the indulgence, which could be transmuted at will into men or money. It was this which enabled Innocent III. to crush the rising heresy of the Cathari—a heresy at one time threatening to carry away half of Christendom from the true faith. Through this it was that Clement IV. triumphed at last over the Hohenstaufen—a triumph which affected the whole course of subsequent European history. This it

was that enabled the papacy to hold and augment its territorial possessions amid the strife of godless Italian republics and princes, for its ability to proclaim a crusade against its enemies was an ever-present danger with which the boldest and most ambitious statesman had to reckon. The crusades proper, against the infidel, moreover, through which, for two centuries, the West wasted its strength in conflict with the East, found their chief source of support in indulgences, without which they would speedily have languished and have been abandoned, and, though their influence has been exaggerated, they form one of the most striking features of European history. It was largely by means of indulgences that the Teutonic knights were able to conquer and Christianize northeastern Germany and that Hungary succeeded in proving a barrier to the Turk.

If the development of the sacramental system vastly increased the power of the priesthood over the laity, the discovery of the treasure of merits, of which the distribution was confided to the pope, aided efficiently in concentrating that power in the Holy See and gave to the whole ecclesiastical organization a compactness for offence and defence contributing greatly to the domination which it succeeded in establishing over the mind and conscience of Europe. If the abuse of that power led to disaffection and if indulgences served as the proximate occasion of the ultimate and inevitable revolt, it serves to point the moral that human misfortunes are usually the result of human aberrations.

Perhaps it may be expected that I should investigate the influence exerted on the average intellect and mental processes of Catholics by the belief inculcated in the power of human formulas over the destiny of the soul and in the benefits ascribed to amulets, such as scapulars, girdles, blessed beads, Holy Land objects, and the like; but this is a question on which I must decline to enter. It is necessarily one dependent upon *a priori* reasoning, to verify which facts are lacking, except in so far as the comparative intellectual progress of Catholic and non-Catholic communities may be supposed to be affected. This is a region in which statistics are scarce available, and the reader is as capable as I am to draw for himself the speculative deductions deducible from the general premises.

In reviewing this long history of the intermediation of the Church between man and his Creator the most salient feature is the complete

change in its attitude. Its earliest efforts were directed to inducing the sinner to reconcile himself with God by contrition for his misdeeds and by amendment. It felt its mission to be to train its members to righteousness and to enforce, by sharp discipline if necessary, a code of morality unknown to the Gentile world. In this it pretended to no supernatural power to save, but it spoke in the name of Christ and held out to each man the alternative of endless bliss or torment; it relieved him of no responsibility and left him to make his choice at his peril, only prescribing the means by which he could placate an offended God. If hardened and unrepentent, it excluded him from its pale; if contrite, the prayers of the congregation interceded for him, and, after death, prayers and the Eucharist served as a propitiation in preparation for the day of judgment.

In the modern Church all this is changed. Step by step it has abandoned its function as the guardian of morality and has devoted itself to smoothing and broadening the steep and narrow path. In each successive age it has claimed that the increasing wickedness of man renders impossible the maintenance of the old severity, and by condescending to that wickedness it has stimulated rather than repressed the evil. Its effort has been, not to make men better, but to save them from the consequences of their sins. The power which it claims as entrusted to it by God has been wielded to elude and not to vindicate the justice of God. Deeming its mission to be the saving of souls, it has mattered little how that end was attained in accordance with the artificial theories of scholastic theology as interpreted by the rules of moral theology. If the sinner cannot be induced to abandon his sin he can at least be kept in ignorance that he sins; his fear of hell can be removed by absolution, and of purgatory by an indulgence; his conscience can be soothed and he can be kept in obedience to the kindly Mother Church whose benignity thus assures him of heaven without imposing burdens on earth too heavy for his weakness.

We have followed the development of this through the ages and have watched the process through which it advanced step by step to its present completeness. We have seen how fortuitous much of this advance has been, and yet how skilfully it has been adapted to the demands of human fragility; how the Church has conquered by yielding, and has preserved its ascendancy by lightening its yoke when that did not affect its supremacy. Thus each advance made in

the claim to supernatural power, and to stand in the place of God, has been followed by a relaxation in the requirements of pardon, and the populations have been trained to look to the Church as the dispenser of salvation.

The revolt of the sixteenth century was the most fortunate event for both parties to the strife. Progressive demoralization had reached a point at which, unless checked from the outside, the Church would speedily have become an instrumentality of unmixed evil. The control of the keys had proved so productive financially that it was becoming used simply as a means of raising money for the corrupt and ambitious court of the Holy See, and to this end its pretensions were advancing in a direction which ere long would have superseded both human and divine justice, and have bartered for cash impunity on earth and in heaven. When the effort to reduce the rebellion proved futile, and, after half a century of struggle, the Church realized that it was to remain face to face with a competitor, it commenced to strip for the conflict by abandoning that which most weighted it down. On the one hand it lightened the burden of the confessional by the subtilties of probabilism and casuistry and suppressed the Jansenistic opposition to these new devices; on the other, it renounced the pecuniary profits which had furnished so large a portion of its revenues. It abated nothing of its claims, while effecting a retreat from a position no longer tenable, but it exercised those claims in a manner to bind its followers to it still closer. Skilled to avail itself of the baser as well as the higher human impulses, its spiritual treasure, no longer exchangeable for temporal wealth, was dispensed with greater liberality than ever, and every sinner was made to feel that if he escaped the penalty of his sins he owed this to the unbought liberality of the Vicegerent of God. Thus the tie between the Church and its children has been strengthened, its organization has been perfected, and there is no reason to doubt that it has entered upon a new career of even wider influence and prosperity than those which have preceded it. Many times in its history has the Church shown its marvellous skill in meeting the vicissitudes which threatened it, but never has its adaptability to new conditions been manifested more ably than in the long development, not even yet concluded, of the counter-Reformation.

THE END.

APPENDIX.

I.

Indulgence for Souls in Purgatory, Granted in 1476, by Sixtus IV. to the Church of Xaintes.

(See page 346.)

Et ut animarum salus eo tempore potius procuretur, quo magis aliorum egent suffragiis et quominus sibiipsis profitere valent, auctoritate apostolica de thesauro ecclesiæ, animabus in purgatorio existentibus succurrere volentes quæ per caritatem ab hac luce Christo unitæ decesserent, et quæ dum viverent sibi ut hujusmodi indulgentia suffragarentur meruerunt, paterno cupientes affectu, quanto cum Deo possumus, de Divina misericordia confisi et de plenitudine potestatis, concedimus pariter et indulgemus, ut si qui parentes, amici aut cæteri Christifideles pietate commoti pro ipsis animabus purgatorio igni pro expiatione pœnarum ejusdem secundum divinam justitiam expositis, durante dicto decennio pro reparatione ecclesiæ Xanctonensi certam pecuniam quantitatem aut valorem juxta dictorum decani et capituli dictæ ecclesiæ aut nostri collectoris ordinationem dictam ecclesiam visitando dederint, aut per nuntios per eosdem deputandos durante dicto decennio miserint, volumus ipsam plenariam remissionem per modum suffragii ipsis animabus purgatorii pro quibus dictam quantitatem pecuniæ aut valorem persolverint ut præfertur pro relaxatione pœnarum valere et suffragari. Volumus insuper omnes utriusque sexus Christifideles, de plenitudine potestatis ex nostra mera liberalitate, qui manus adjutrices visitando vel mittendo per supradictos nuntios pro dicta ecclesia porrexerint, ac omnes et singulos eorundem parentes defunctos aut eorum benefactores qui cum caritate decesserint, in omnibus suffragiis, præcibus eleemosinis, jejuniis, orationibus, disciplinis et cæteris omnibus spiritualibus bonisqui fiunt et fieri poterunt in tota universali sacrosancta Christi ecclesia militante et omnibus membris ejusdem, participes in perpetuo fieri. Et quia hujusmodi nostræ indulgentiæ quibusdam legitimis impedimentis anno MCCCCLXXVI. ad plenum denuntiari non valuerunt diebus et temporibus juxta aliarum nostrarum literarum tenore statutis, motu et auctoritate prædictis volumus et decernimus ut ejusdem istius MCCCCLXXVI. anni quarti, diebus continuis quibus fieri possit a primis vesperis illius solemnitatis festivitatis quam decanus et capitulum duntaxat duxerint eligendam usque ad occasum quartæ diei immediate sequentis, hujusmodi nostræ indulgentiæ quoad

omnia et singula ut in aliis et hujusmodi nostris literis planius continetur, plenum sortiantur valorem et effectum, nonobstantibus quibuscumque in contrarium facientibus. Ne autem propter alias indulgentias, in illis forsan partibus concessas, et in posterum concedendas, præmissarum indulgentiarum explicatio impediatur, aut Christifidelium mentes ab illarum salutari præmio traherentur, universis et singulis cujuscunque dignitatis, status, gradus vel conditionis aut præeminentiæ personis, ne in civitate Xanctonensi alias indulgentias plenarias publicare aut executioni demandare seu publicari vel executioni demandari facere præsumant aut permittant sub excommunicationis latæ sententiæ pœna, eo ipso districtius inhibemus, alias indulgentias quoad civitatem et diœcesim Xanctonensem prædictas, dicto durante decennio, suspendendas nulliusque firmitatis existere decernentes. Datum ut supra in magna bulla.

II.

Compilatio Magistri Johannis de Fabrica super Relaxatione Pœnarum Animarum Purgatorii.

(See page 347.)

Supposito quod papa aut sanctus eligitur aut promotione clarus efficitur (Symmachus papa di. xl. c. non nos). Et etiam quod vicarius Petri vel melius Christi non de facili debet de eo haberi præsumptio mali (eadem di. c. eodem). Et quod ex ipso dependet salus omnium (Jo. Criso. e. di. c. si papa). Et quod causam de papa terminandam Deus suo judicio reservaverit nisi in casu erroris (eo. ca.). Et quod debet reputari statutum papæ ac si ab ore Dei vel beati Petri esset prolatum (Agato papa di. xix. c. sic omnes). Nec licet alicui de ejus judicio judicare sive disputare (Nicolaus papa xvii. q. iiii. c. nemini). Et quod est approbandum vel reprobandum quod papa approbat vel reprobat (Nicolaus papa di. xix. c. si Romanorum). Nec resistendum præceptis apostolicis dura superbia (Gre. di. xii. c. præceptis). Et quod maiores causæ et difficiliores sunt ad papam referendæ (Pelagius di. xvii. c. multis). Et quod portandum est illud quod papa præcipit licet videatur vix tollerabile (di. xix. c. in memoria). Et quod habet jus cœlestis et terreni imperii (di. xxii. c. omnes xii. xvii. xix. xxii. xl. xlvii.: q. iiii. c. si quis suadente). Quæritur utrum si papa aliqua suffragia pro defunctis in purgatorio existentibus ordinaverit: valeant ad liberationem animarum pœnis totaliter expiandarum vel partialiter. Et videtur quod non. Dicitur enim in evangelio Quodcumque ligaveris super terram erit etc. ergo non potest ligare et solvere nisi existentes super terram: tales non sunt animæ in purgatorio. In oppositum arguitur quod statutum est a papa debet reputari ac si ore beati Petri esset probatum (di. xix. c. sic omnes). Sed si ore Petri tale esset prolatum nullus dubitaret: ergo nec modo. Pro dictæ quæstionis elucidatione tria sunt videnda. Primum quibus modis tam vivis quam defunctis existentibus in purgatorio papa possit suffragari. Secundum

an per modum auctoritatis possit tales liberare. Tertium an de facto eis suffragetur.[1]

Defunctis an scilicet papa possit de hujusmodi thesauro ecclesiæ suffragari· Respondetur consimiliter quod sic. Sed relinquitur ut certum quod vivis per modum auctoritatis. Dubitatur tamen et pro secundo articulo an existentibus in purgatorio per modum auctoritatis. Ad quod videtur respondendum et secundum opinionem Alexandri de Hales, Sancti Thomæ, Bonaventuræ, Richardi de Mediavilla, venerabilis inceptoris Guillelmi Okan quod nullus debet dubitare de conclusione, videlicet an papa possit thesaurum ecclesiæ talibus applicare, dum tamen per vivos agatur quod continetur in forma indulgentiarum, et communiter istud tenetur per modum suffragii. Probabiliter tamen michi videtur aliqualiter per modum auctoritatis, aliquibus persuasivis rationibus. Prima, summus pontifex Gregorius secundum Johannem Damascenum liberavit Traianum ab inferis, non quia oravit tantum, sed quia summus pontifex. Sed inter summos pontifices auctoritate unus non est maior altero. Item, sic communiter creditur Romæ quod nunquam celebratur missa super altare sancti Sebastiani quin anima una liberetur de purgatorio, sed nullus dubitat quod non est ratione missæ absolutæ, igitur aliud, quod intelligo auctoritate fore summi pontificis. Item legitur de beato Anthonio de Padua quod nunquam sumebat corpus Christi nisi habita revelatione quod aliqua anima liberaretur a purgatorio. Merita Christi sine comparatione maiora sunt et in potestate summi pontificis. Sed dices tales non sunt de jurisdictione summi pontificis: multipliciter potest responderi. Primo quod thesauri sunt in potestate summi pontificis, ideo potest illos applicare quibus rationabiliter vult; dato quod non essent de sua jurisdictione, sicut rex Francorum potest thesauros suos Anglicis conferre, non enim oportet illum cui datur aliquid esse de jurisdictione dantis. Vel aliter quod existens in purgatorio est directe de jurisdictione summi pontificis quantum ad pœnam quam patitur. Persuadetur hoc sic. Quis a summo pontifice excommunicatus quamcunque ingrediat terram semper est subjectus summo pontifici quantum ad absolutionem a tali excommunicatione et ita sibi subjectus sicut si staret Romæ. Ad propositum dico quod qui decedit purgandus a purgatorio auctoritate clavis ligantis ad certam pœnam temporalem et absolventis a pœna æterna commutantis æternam in temporalem est in hoc de jurisdictione ligantis, dato quod in se non esset de jurisdictione sua. Hæc possunt persuaderi quod sicut viventes hac vita potest summus pontifex et ligare et solvere, beatos nec ligare nec solvere, ita purgandos solvere non ligare. Item legimus Petrum præcipisse dæmonibus auctoritative et obedisse eidem in casu Simonis Magi. Item in evangelio Domine etiam dæmonia in nomine tuo subjiciuntur nobis. Item invenimus in multis bullis papam præcipisse angelis, et tamen dæmones et angeli minus sunt de jurisdictione summi pontificis quam animæ purgandæ. Ad auctoritatem quodcumque ligaveris, etc., respondetur quod illa est una copulativa ligare et absolvere simul, et ad illum sensum illam concedo, unde dicitur quodcumque ligaveris super terram erit ligatum et in

[1] A long explanation of the treasure and its application to the living is omitted here as of no special interest to the student.

cœlis. Et sic concedo quod non potest ligare et solvere nisi existentes super terram. Sed de purgandis qui mediant inter ecclesiam militantem et triumphantem papa medio modo se habet scilicet ad solvere tantum. In hac conclusione melius est stare cum dictis doctoribus et potestatem summi pontificis exaltare quam innitendo sinistre sensui proprio quod verum est impugnare.

Hoc scripsit pro dubio quodam tollendo ex bullis Xanctonensibus indulgentiarum doctor quidam theologus et profundus magister Johannes de Fabrica, Pictavis, Anno millesimo quadringentesimo lxxvi.

III.

Summaria Declaratio Bullæ Indulgentiarum Ecclesiæ Xanctonensi pro reparatione ejusdem et tuitione fidei concessarum.[1]

(See page 348.)

Primo notandum est quod quatuor gratiæ principaliter conceduntur per dictas bullas cunctis Christifidelibus dictam ecclesiam Xanctonensem certis diebus visitantibus aut ad illam per nuntios ecclesiæ de bonis suis mittentibus. Prima gratia concessa supradictis fidelibus est gratia jubilæi. Et quia jubilæus per omnia et singula conceditur cunctis Christifidelibus de bonis suis mittentibus sicuti visitantibus dictam ecclesiam necessario attendendum est circa quæ primo conceduntur visitantibus dictam ecclesiam ut per illa cognoscatur quot et quales indulgentiæ, gratiæ et facultates conceduntur mittantibus pariter ad instar visitantium. Sequitur textus bullæ.

"Sixtus episcopus servus servorum Dei universis Christifidelibus præsentes litteras inspecturis salutem et apostolicam benedictionem. Salvator noster Dei Patris unigenitus Christus Iesus qui pro universorum salute fidelium carnem sumere et crucem subire non abnuit ac beato Petro apostolorum principi collatis sibi clavibus regni cœlestis ligandi atque solvendi tradidit potestatem, ejusque vicarii tam excellentissime auctoritatis plenitudine stabilivit successoribus suis qui ejus vices tenuerent in terris exemplum laudabile præbuit imitandum, ut sicut idem redemptor noster humano genere salutem præparavit et nam [?]. Ita nos qui insufficientibus meritis ipsius apostolorum principis sumus ordinatione superna successores effecti considerantes venerabiles ecclesias præcipue cathedrales insignes non modico sumptuoso opere constructas sæpius non mediocribus reparationibus et restaurationibus indigere ac ecclesias ipsas ne ad ruinam perpetuam tendant Christifidelium donis et muneribus temporalibus, ipsosque Christifideles sanctorum meritis et intercessionibus ac indulgentiis

[1] From the same tract as Appendix I. and II., issued by the Church of Xaintes to defend and advertise its indulgences. This *Summarium* is quite long, occupying sixteen folio pages. Only the more important and significant portions are here printed.

et remissionibus præsertim plenariis multum posse adjuvari pro ecclesiarum hujusmodi restaurationibus et reparationibus fiendum, Christifidelibus prædictis ad consequendum cum electis æternæ hæreditatis et beatitudinis portionem indefessas nostræ vigilantiæ curas totis viribus impendamus. Dudum siquidem cupientes ut ecclesia Xanctonensis quæ secunda in honore beati Petri principis apostolorum extitit in toto orbe terrarum erecta et per Carolum Magnum dotata et quæ sumptuoso plurimum opere ædificari ut accepimus cœpta erat, ad cujus operis consummationem necnon chori, claustri, navis et aliorum ædificiorum ejus Dei ecclesiæ reparationem, quæ etiam deformitati subjacere videbantur et irreparabilem minabantur ruinam, propriæ non suppetant facultates sed ad hoc Christifidelium suffragia fore noscuntur quamplurimum opportuna, carissimi, in Christo filii nostri Ludovici Christianissimi Francorum regis, ac dilecti Jacobi fratris nostri tituli Sancti Grisogoni presbyteri cardinalis Papiensis nuncupati qui archidiaconatum de Alvisio in dicta ecclesia ex apostolica dispensatione obtinet, piis supplicationibus et desideriis inclinati, indulgentiam et plenissimam peccatorum remissionem per felicis recordationis Nicolaum quintum et Pium secundum Romanos pontifices prædecessores nostros Christifidelibus dictam ecclesiam certis tunc expressis diebus et temporibus concessas cum certis facultatibus prout in nostris inde consertis literis quarum ac prædecessorum eorundem literarum hujusmodi formas et tenores ac si de verbo ad verbum præsentibus insererentur haberi volumus pro expressis plenius continentur de novo concessimus et præsentium tenore confirmamus et in earum robore quoad omnia et singula in eis contenta permanere volumus. Cum autem sicut accepimus a nonnullis revocetur in dubium an dictam ecclesiam Xanctonensem modis et formis ut in aliis literis nostris continetur visitantes easdem tales et tantas consequuntur quales et quantas indulgentias quæ certas basilicas et ecclesias almæ urbis anno jubilæi ad hoc deputatas visitantes consequuntur, et an episcopus, decanus et capitulum prædictæ ecclesiæ Xanctonensis per se et seorsum confessores deputare valeant, Nos igitur hujusmodi ambiguitates de medio amputare et prædicti dilectissimi filii Ludovici Christianissimi Francorum regis et dilectæ in Christo filiæ Carolæ reginæ ejus consortis piis iteratis precibus inclinati et amplioris gratiæ prorogativa dictam ecclesiam Xanctonensem prosequi volentes ac cupientes ut dictæ ecclesiæ ruinæ obvietur, necnon fidelibus ipsis devotio eo magis augeatur qui ex hoc dono cœlestis gratiæ conspexerint se refectos, litteras ac indulgentias prædictas quoad terminum festi penthecostes ab occasu tertiæ feriæ immediate sequentis, harum nostrarum literarum seriem apostolica auctoritate extendentes pariter et ampliantes decernimus quod præfati qui dictam ecclesiam visitaverint et manus adjutrices porrexerint tantas et tales indulgentias consequentur quales et quantas fideles ipsi utriusque sexus anno jubilæi almæ urbis certas basilicas visitantes juxta nostrarum et prædecessorum nostrorum super hoc confectarum literarum tenorem consequuti fuerunt aut consequi potuerunt et poterunt in futurum. Indulgentias autem et remissiones ad instar jubilæi et ipsum jubilæum in forma ecclesiæ consueta auctoritate prædicta ex certa nostra scientia de nostræ plenitudinis potestate et de Domini miseratione confisi, tenore præsentium eisdem visitantibus elargimur et indulgemus. Volentes tamen quod ad instar ecclesiarum urbis dicti Christifideles habeant visitare quatuor altaria per dictos

decanum et capitulum deputanda. Circa quod notandum quod ex tenore bullarum apostolicarum visitantes ecclesiam Xanctonensem habent tales et tantas indulgentias quales visitantes basilicas urbis tempore jubilæi, scilicet jubilæum in forma ecclesiæ consueta."

Et ut dicti Christifideles possint facilius promereri dictum jubilæum S. D. N. dat tripliciter facultatem confessoribus deputatis vel deputandis in ecclesia, et talem habent deputati per nuntios in aliis locis. Ex quo per omnia et singula mittentes habent tales et tantas indulgentias, gratias et facultates, ac si Xanctonensem ecclesiam visitassent, mittendo per supradictos nuntios. Videant prædicatores quomodo sex laude digna conferebantur tempore jubilæi, Levitcus XXII.[1]

Secunda gratia concessa indifferenter omnibus et singulis Christifidelibus dictam ecclesiam Xanctonensem visitantibus vel ad illorum arbitrium ad dictam ecclesiam de bonis suis per nuntios ecclesiæ mittentibus est facultas confessionalis quæ præter confessionalia solita dari continet unum singulare, scilicet præter totiens quotiens de casibus reservatis diocesanis et præter remissionem semel in vita et in mortis articulo, continet remissionem plenariam nedum semel in vita sed totiens quotiens homo verisimiliter dubitat de morte sua etiam si tunc non moriatur, ut puta existens in procella maris, homines existentes in obsidione, mulieres prope partum vel in partu, moram trahentes in loco in quo viget pestis, et sic de multis aliis. Ista est inaudita clausula, præcipue pro transfretantibus. Ista clausula debet praticari erga illos qui dicunt se habere confessionalia. [Sequitur textus.] . . .

Tertia gratia præcipua et per sanctissimum Dominum nostrum concessa est remissio plenaria et gratia jubilæi animabus in purgatorio existentibus, quæ gratia licet multos homines ducat in admirationem ex eo præcipue quod a multis temporibus non legitur fuisse concessa, tum si videantur theologiæ doctores ut puta Sanctus Thomas in Quarto in materia indulgentiarum et suffragiorum secundo et quarto di. c., irrefragabilis doctor Alexander de Hales in Quarto, Sanctus Dominus Bonaventura ad longum protractando, Franciscus de Maronis, Durandus de Sancto Porciano in suis duobus operibus, Egidius de Roma diffuse, Thomas de Argentina, Richardus de Mediavilla, de Tarantesia, de Turrecremata ordinis prædicatorum cardinalis dum viveret Sancti Sixti

[1] Here follows a very long and detailed enumeration of the faculties enjoyed by the confessors deputed by the dean and chapter, including absolution of all reserved papal cases, even those of the *Cœna Domini*, composition of vows and removal of excommunications, with relief from all disabilities, which shall be valid even before the courts—"quæ facultas etiam valet quoad forum judiciale et contradictorium." Also to compound for all ill-gotten gains, of which the owner is unknown, on payment of a whole or a part to the church of Xaintes, "ita quoad illorum restitutionem amplius non tenerentur nec ad id possent per quempiam invicti coartari." The "collectors," or *quæstuarii*, were also empowered to receive from simoniacal incumbents the fictitious resignations of their benefices and confer them again on the spot, with permission to compound for the ill-acquired fruits.

defunctus superioribus annis, Augustus de Ancarano in tractatu quem fecit de potestate summi pontificis, et videantur pariter omnes theologiæ doctores qui de materia indulgentiarum loquuntur qui omnes conveniunt quod summus pontifex et solus potest dare plenariam indulgentiam animabus in purgatorio existentibus. Videantur pariter summæ compositæ per duos juristas, ut puta Summa Anthonina, Summa Astantii [Astesana]. Videantur pariter Innocentius et Panormitanus in rubrica seu titulo de Pœnitentiis et Remissionibus. Tales qui ducuntur in admirationem et dubium si videre dignentur dictos doctores et alios quamplures, si aliter non velint credere auctoritati ecclesiæ, de quo Augustinus dicit evangelio non crederem nisi quia ecclesiæ crederem, saltem debent credere secundum quod continetur in bulla, quod papa potest dare remissionem plenariam animabus in purgatorio per modum suffragii qui modus per modum suffragii non derogat modo auctoritatis. Et dicere papam hoc posse facere per modum auctoritatis, ut dicit Bonaventura non est multum improbe resistendum, immo debemus agere gratiam Deo qui talem potestatem dedit summo pontifici qualis potest dari homini puro. Sed quod dicitur per modum suffragii non est intelligendum, sicut multi simplices voluerunt dicere, scilicet per modum suffragii ac si fierent preces vel darentur eleemosynæ pro animabus præfatis, quam opinionem S. D. N. per unam bullam, pro ista materia damnavit, cum suffragia ecclesiæ et indulgentia per modum suffragii videantur differe sicuti finitum ab infinito quantum ad efficaciam satisfactionis, quia suffragia sunt finita in satisfactione, et indulgentiæ ratione meriti passionis Christi in quo fundantur sunt infinitæ quoad satisfactionem si pœnæ essent infinitæ in purgatorio per impossibile de lege posita. Sed debet intelligi per modum suffragii, hoc est quia indulgentiæ dantur semper pro pia causa, ut puta communiter pro tuitione fidei vel reparatione ecclesiarum, præcipue insignium, et quia animæ in purgatorio non possunt aliquid contribuere ideo indigent auxilio amici qui faciat illud pro quo data est indulgentia, ut puta dare quotam ordinatam per capitulum, et hoc est per modum suffragii, sicuti si summus pontifex daret indulgentiam etiam pauperibus viventibus non potentibus dare sub hac forma, ut puta si aliquis parentum aut amicorum daret illud quod statueretur in bulla, sic dare indulgentiam etiam vivis pauperibus esset per modum suffragii. Ideo valde decipiuntur aliqui credentes quod per modum suffragii aliquid diminuat de indulgentia plenaria cum nichil diminuat, sed duntaxat arguit impossibilitatem ex parte animarum in purgatorio ad faciendum contenta in bulla. Et ab illis qui sic ducuntur in admirationem quærendum est ab eis qua ratione per ecclesiæ suffragia et qualiter unusquisque Christianus qui non est distributor thesauri ecclesiæ utilis neque est vicarius Christi potest prodesse animabus in purgatorio ut in c. animæ defunctorum XXVII. q. iiii. et c. quod autem de pe. et re. in antiquis. Et hac ratione meriti passionis Christi, in quo valor et efficatia omnium ecclesiæ suffragiorum fundatur, et multo magis vicarii Christi qui est generalis distributor hujusmodi thesauri, sentire oppositum videtur sapere hæresim. Item cum summus pontifex in articulo mortis possit remittere pœnitentias debitas in purgatorio videtur quod pœna purgatorii sit de foro suo, et sic per modum auctoritatis videtur hoc facere cum etiam purgatorium non sit nisi carcer

ecclesiæ. Item unusquisque reus sortitur forum ratione delicti ad quemcunque locum se transferat etiam extra territorium in quo fecit delictum semper remanet sub jurisdictione domini sub quo fecit delictum ad quem dominum spectat eum remittere vel punire, videtur ergo quod quia animæ fecere delictum in hoc mundo sub jurisdictione summi pontificis dum viverent, quod ratione pœnæ sequentis tale delictum fuit sub jurisdictione summi pontificis. Sunt aliæ infinitæ rationes quæ possunt adduci contra tales sine causa admirantes, sed quia istæ sunt clariores contra rudes illas volui inserere pro simplicibus cum supportatione magistrorum nostrorum ad quos spectat rationes demonstrativas et non dialecticas determinare. Sed tu posses dicere quod non sunt de foro papæ quia Christus non dedit potestatem Petro et suis successoribus ligandi et solvendi nisi illos qui sunt super terram, quod patet per illud quod dicitur Matthæi XXVI. Quodcunque ligaveris super terram etc. Dicitur quod licet existentes in purgatorio non sint super terram pro nunc, tamen cum meruerunt ut communicatio thesauri ecclesiæ sibi prodesse posset erant super terram. Et ideo licet simpliciter non sint super terram tum ratione meriti quo meruerunt ut post mortem per indulgentias juvari possent, sunt etiam quodammodo super terram ut dicit De Turrecremata, quia sicut hii qui sunt super terram sunt in via et non in termino ita et existentes in purgatorio sunt in via et in transitu ad patriam quantum ad mundationem suæ pœnæ qua mundantur licet sint in termino quantum ad confirmationem, quia amplius peccare non possunt. Vel dicendum quod illud quodcunque solveris super terram etc intelligitur quodcunque solveris super terram per modum auctoritatis sed non per modum suffragii, tam existentes super terram quam existentes in purgatorio. Non enim potest solvere aliquos per modem auctoritatis [si] non habeat jurisdictionem super eos sed bene potest communicare aliquibus, super quibus non habet jurisdictionem, thesaurum, et hoc est eis suffragari. Et sic papa potest solvere existentes in purgatorio per modum suffragii. Unde nota quod ista propositio Quotcunque solveris super terram habet duplicem sensum, secundum quod illa additio super terram potest determinare illud pronomen tu, vel ly quotcunque si determinet pronomen tu tunc est sensus Quodcunque tu Petrus existens vicarius meus super terram solveris illud reputabo solutum et in cœlis, et sic vera propositio quod papa solvit animas a purgatorio, ipso existente vicario Christi super terram. Sicut etiam solveret vivos si ly super terram determinet ly quodcunque; tunc est sensus quodcunque solubile existens super terram tu solveris, illud est solutum in cœlo. Et similiter est vera propositio quod papa solvit animas a purgatorio existentes super terram quoad meritum et quoad suffragia. Nam super terram esse dicuntur quoad suffragia ecclesiæ et eis communicari possunt sicut vivis. Etiam sunt super terram quoad hoc quia meruerunt quando decesserunt in charitate ut illis indulgentiæ et cetera suffragia applicari possent. Item dicuntur esse super terram et sunt realiter quia sunt de ecclesia militante et non triumphante. Item purgatorium est in terra et etiam multi doctores tenent quod animæ in purgatorio existentes dicuntur facere pœnam ubi commisere delictum et hoc videmus aliquotiens quomodo spiritus sive animæ post mortem apparuerunt suis amicis implorantes suffragia ecclesiæ. Si dicatur quod papa non potest illos ligare ergo neque

solvere, respondetur dupliciter. Primo quod non sequitur quia ipsi dum viverent non meruerunt ut ligarentur sive ut ligari possent post mortem sed bene meruerunt dum viverent ut juvari et solvi possent post mortem, vel dicitur quod tunc non est tempus ligandi sed bene solvendi. Et si dicatur quod ipsi non sunt de foro papæ, respondet Bonaventura quod licet quantum ad statum pœnitentiæ non sint de foro ecclesiæ tamen bene ratione meriti quo meruerint ut juvari possent. Vel dicit quod licet non sint de foro justitiæ ipsius papæ et ecclesiæ sunt tamen de foro misericordiæ. Vel dicitur secundum Alexandrum de Hales quod immo sunt de foro ipsius ecclesiæ militantis quantum ad solutionem suæ pœnæ licet non quantum ad alia. Datur tale exemplum; episcopus Lucionensis excommunicavit aliquem de sua diœcesi propter aliquid forefactum; ille sic excommunicatus vadit moratum Parisius; iste licet non amplius sit de jurisdictione episcopi Lucionensis quantum ad omnia est tamen de jurisdictione sua quantum ad absolutionem ab excommunicatione quod non potest absolvi ab episcopo Parisiensi. Similiter et existentes in purgatorio dum viverent erant de foro ecclesiæ, et dum viverent in eorum confessione virtute clavium ecclesiæ fuit commutata pœna æterna in pœnam temporalem ad quam sustinendam vel hic vel in purgatorio fuerunt obligati; quia igitur virtute clavium ecclesiæ dum existerent super terram fuerunt obligati ad sustinendum illam pœnam vel hic vel in purgatorio, licet quoad nunc non sint de foro ecclesiæ quoad omnia, tamen quantum ad solutionem ipsius pœnæ sunt de foro ecclesiæ et possunt solvi de thesauro ecclesiæ. Et cum tales ducti in admirationem dicunt se non vidisse concessas tales indulgentias, si fuissent tempore Calixti qui dedit talem gratiam in Hispania ecclesiæ cathedrali Tirasensi potuissent vidisse talem indulgentiam. Si tales vadant ad urbem poterunt videre in ecclesia Sanctæ Praxedis quomodo Paschasius quintus dedit indulgentiam plenariam per modum suffragii animabus in purgatorio quam undecim summi pontifices confirmaverunt, prout legitur in authentica litera in introitu capellæ in qua est columna ad quam fuit ligatus Christus in domo Pilati, quæ in maxima reverentia habetur, et taliter quod etiam mulieres non intrant capellam istam, et fuit data illa indulgentia in hanc formam quod quicumque celebraverit vel celebrari fecerit quinque missas pro anima parentis aut amici existentis in purgatorio dictus Paschasius dat remissionem plenariam per modum suffragii tali animæ. Et ibi habetur quod dictus Paschasius post mortem cujusdam sui nepotis dictas quinque missas pro anima nepotis in dicta capella celebravit, scribitur ibi quod post celebrationem quintæ missæ, dum adhuc erat in altari dictæ capellæ apparuit sibi supra altare in testitudine fenestræ quæ est ante altare Virgo Maria visibiliter extrahens animam nepotis a purgatorio. Hæc sunt vera, approbata et authentice scripta in introitu dictæ capellæ. Item plures summi pontifices dederunt pariter indulgentiam plenariam pro animabus in purgatorio visitando ecclesiam beati Laurentii extra muros de urbe, prædictis animabus in hunc modum prout legitur etiam in duplo bullæ coram magno altare sub quo jacent corpora beati Laurentii et beati Stephani protomartyris; scilicet quod quicunque singulis quartis feriis totius anni dictam ecclesiam devote pro anima patris aut alterius existentis in purgatorio visitaverit dicti summi pontifices dant remissionem plenariam dictæ

animæ pro qua dicti fideles dictam ecclesiam visitaverint et hoc per modum suffragii. Nunquid etiam tenetur in urbe quod quicunque celebraverit vel celebrari fecerit unam missam et in altari beati Sebastiani extra urbem unam animam liberabit a purgatorio. Sed meritum Christi multo majoris meriti quam meritum missæ; idcirco etc. Ista sunt antiqua hiis qui visitaverint urbem si voluerint videre supradicta. Non tamen est mirandum si tales ad pauca respicientes mirari habeant, cum etiam cum primum fuerint datæ indulgentiæ plenariæ pro vivis tempore beati Gregorii tanta fuit difficultas ad informandum populum quomodo summus pontifex possit ad suum arbitrium remittere pœnas debitas pro peccatis, quod doctor venerabilis Altissiodorensis in sua summa recitat quod per centum annos duravit briga post beatum Gregorium antequam ad plenum reciperentur indulgentiæ plenariæ pro vivis. Hæc pauca ex multis sufficiunt illis qui maiora in hac materia non viderunt.

Quarta et ultima gratia quæ non multum minoris efficaciæ videtur quam tertia facultas pro animabus in purgatorio. Scilicit S. D. N. volens ostendere distinctionem inter indulgentiam plenariam pro animabus in purgatorio per modum suffragii et inter suffragia ecclesiæ pro dictis animabus concedit unam quartam clausulam distinctam ab tertia pro dictis animabus quantum ad applicationem suffragiorum ecclesiæ pro dictis animabus in purgatorio existentibus et etiam pro dictis fidelibus porrigentibus manus adjutrices dictæ ecclesiæ vult et concedit quod dicti fideles manus adjutrices porrigentes et illorum parentes et benefactores defuncti qui cum charitate decesserunt, ut puta quorum animæ sunt in purgatorio sint participes in omnibus suffragiis ecclesiæ universalis nunc et in perpetuum, quæ est maxima gratia si bene praticetur. Primo quoad vivos qui multotiens propter ecclesiæ suffragia ab infinitis malis præservuntur, etiam quando sunt in peccato mortali et non sunt digni exaudiri. In quantum participant virtute hujus gratiæ in suffragiis ecclesiæ, ecclesia orat Deum pro illis ratione cujus ab inauditis et infinitis malis liberantur et facilius resurgunt a peccato mortali et a statu peccati ad primam gratiam. . . . Quomodo etiam talia suffragia prosunt defunctis amicis parentibus aut benefactoribus in hunc modum ut apparet, videlicet: quia omnia ecclesiæ suffragia ratione charitatis in qua decesserunt et sunt dictæ animæ per dicta suffragia concurrere possunt ratione hujusmodi participationis ad satisfactionem totalem et plenariam c. quod autem de pe. et re, pro dictis animabus cum hæc sit intentio summi pontificis ad quem sic vel sic spectat applicare auctoritative et dispensative ecclesiæ thesaurum et etiam ecclesiæ suffragia. Ex quo sequitur quod dicti fideles dictam gratiam participationis obtinentes, qui erant obligati ad preces et cætera ecclesiæ suffragia pro dictis animabus parentum aut benefactorum a quibus ut in pluribus receperunt bona ex quibus vivunt et sustentantur, ratione dictæ participationis exonerant multum sua conscientia erga dictos parentes et benefactores defunctos virtute hujusmodi indulgentiæ [Sequitur textus]. Super ista gratia notandum est quod licet sit distincta a gratia confessionali, et quod etiam juxta tenorem bullæ debeat dari nova taxa, tamen dominus decanus et capitulum ecclesiæ Xanctonensis et commissarius apostolicus ordinaverunt unam taxam dari pro confessionali et participatione suffragiorum ecclesiæ universalis, duas taxas

reducentes ad unam taxam minimam in comparatione ad tales et tantas gratias simul contentas in dicto confessionali. Ideo quando multi mirantur de taxa dicentes quod habuerint confessionale tempore aliarum indulgentiarum pro ita parvo pretio quod cedit in scandalum totius ecclesiæ cum videatur fuisse factum de dictis confessionalibus sicuti fit de mercibus, et exposita sunt venditioni et ludibrio, dicendo quid vultis michi dare, et ego vobis tradam illam. Respondendo est dupliciter. Primo quod thesaurus ecclesiæ non debet sic vilipendi sicut temporalia, et quod in urbe unum confessionale simplex quod neque continet remissionem plenariam totiens quotiens homo dubitat de morte neque continet participationem omnium ecclesiæ suffragiorum pro vivis et defunctis sicuti istud taxatum est ad tres florenos vel fere etc. Item pariter alia confessionalia virtute aliarum indulgentiarum acquisita non continet illa duo singularia puncta. Ideo non mirandum venit quod taxa excedit alias taxas; ideo deberent potius tales admirari quod attento tali thesauro et stilo curiæ Romanæ taxa confessionalis et participationis sit ita parva. Et si tales fortassis avaritia ducti credunt nimiam taxam attendant quod non verentur singulis diebus pro sustentatione corporali maiorem taxam exponere de quo non conqueruntur, quantominus deberent facere exponendo pro salute, quia corpus est plus quam indumentum et anima plus quam corpus. Hæc scripta sunt proper aliquos qui conquesti sunt de taxa. Et cum arguunt ergo pauperes non acquirent dictas indulgentias, respondetur cum doctoribus quod etiam in aliquibus conditio pauperis est deterior quam divitis, scilicet in materia indulgentiarum quæ solet dari pro pia causa porrigendo manus adjutrices et quia pauperes summæ [*sic*] non possunt dare ideo in illo casu sunt deterioris conditionis quam divites. Et dico salva aliorum pace quod melius est quod pauperes non acquirant hujusmodi indulgentias quam sit propter tales thesaurum ecclesiæ vilipendi, quod fieret sicut factum fuit dando sic confessionalia magis conferenti et etiam minus conferenti sicuti sit de mercibus et ita reducendo ad parvam taxam, cum non sint facienda bona ut inde sequantur mala, verumtamen spectat ad commissarium attendere aliquando ad statum pauperum, prout solet facere et honestum est. Item notandum pro instructione aliquorum simplicium quod jubilæus sine aliis tribus facultatibus et e contra alia sine jubilæo, et pariter unaquæque facultas sine alia obtineri potest, ut puta jubilæus per se pro animabus in purgatorio per se; etiam associatio et participatio in suffragiis ecclesiæ universalis licet etiam ponatur in confessionali potest obtineri per se et tunc dando est modica taxa quam taxata pro confessionali et dicta participatio cum una taxa sit ordinata pro duabis gratiis. Item notandum est pro solutione aliquarum dubitationum, utrum oporteat homines confiteri pro obtinendis quibuscunque supradictis quatuor gratiis, respondetur quod pro obtinendo gratiam jubilæi et remissionis plenariæ oportet homines confiteri, et causa est quia remissio respicit proprie abolitionem pœnæ temporalis commutatæ ex pœna æterna virtute contritionis et confessionis in effectu vel in voto, quæ contritio dicitur delere culpam dispositive a Deo autem effective delet illam remittendo. Aliæ autem tres gratias utputa gratia confessionalis, indulgentia plenaria pro animabus in purgatorio et associatio sive participatio in suffragiis ecclesiæ universalis possunt acquiri sine confi-

tendo, immo, quod plus est, confessionale potest accipi et acquiri pro amico absente non cogitante et tunc valebit illi quando acceptabit, sed quando vult uti dicto confessionali tunc oportebit confiteri. Et quia indulgentia non sortitur suam efficatiam virtute charitatis amici dantis eleemosynam pro dictis animabus sed virtute charitatis in qua decesserunt dictæ animæ ab hoc sæculo virtute cujus sunt capaces indulgentiarum et ecclesiæ suffragiorum et nobiscum unitæ, ideo non est necessarium hominem volentem acquirere dictam gratiam pro dictis animabus confiteri, esset tamen ad meritum acquirentis si hoc faciat et magis gratum Deo. Neque pro dictis gratiis visitandæ sunt ecclesiæ deputatæ pro jubilæo sicuti pro vivis, sed dumtaxat danda est taxa in capsa pro illis animabus pro quibus vult dictam indulgentiam pro illis valere et suffragari: hoc idem dicendum est de participatione suffragiorum universalis ecclesiæ. Cætera autem relinquo discretioni magistrorum nostrorum et cætera.

Item summe notandum est et attendendum circa pœnas quas incurrunt ipso facto impedientes publicationem hujusmodi indulgentiarum, sive directe aut indirecte fiat et pariter contra murmurantes, et quod dictæ indulgentiæ prosunt, etiam licentia cujuscunque minime quæsita publicari ubicumque locorum. Pœnæ sunt excommunicatio, anathema, maledictio æterna, et quoad ecclesiasticos suspensio a divinis, quas pœnas sententiæ excommunicationis, anathematizationis et suspensionis ipso facto impedientes seu murmurantes incurrunt. Item sub similibus pœnis præcepit quibuscumque etiam religiosis mendicantibus et non mendicantibus nonobstantibus quibuscunque privilegiis de non publicando indulgentias et non posse cogi sub censuris quod dictas indulgentias publicare habeant dum fuerint requisiti. Item S. D. N. vult quod hæredes usurpatorum bonorum hujusmodi indulgentiæ etiam possint cogi ad restitutionem illorum quæ usurpata fuerint præter supradictas pœnas. [Sequitur textus] . . .

Videant pariter prædicatores clausulam contentam in bulla Clementis sexti in tractatu de purgatorio pro ista materia impresso, qui in bulla quam fecit de jubilæo istam clausulam per modum auctoritatis inseruit; sequitur clausula—

"Item concedimus quod si vere confessus in via moriatur quod ab omnibus peccatis suis sit penitus absolutus, et nichilominus mandamus angelis paradisi quatenus animam illius [a purgatorio] prorsus absolutam in paradisi gloriam introducant."

INDEX TO PART II.

(VOLUME III.)

ABBOTS grant indulgences, 13
Abelard, episcopal indulgences, 163
Ablassbriefe, Tetzel's, 402
Abraham's Bosom, 315
Absolution, in early Church, 7
unnecessary for indulgence, 31
necessary for indulgence, 112
in John XXIII.'s indulgence, 68
a pœna et a culpa, 69, 76
after death, 332
releases from justice, 402
Abuses, how to be corrected, 421, 445
Tridentine plan for reform, 422, 559
denounced by Pius V., 424
Acts of Devotion, indulgences for, 529
A pœna et a culpa indulgences, 55
revoked, 70
Addai asks prayers for his soul, 322
Ad instar indulgences, 71
Adrian VI. on deficient penances, 32
on gaining more efficiently, 43
value of indulgences, 49
days of penance or purgatory, 88
sufficiency of cause, 98
proportionate payment, 103
proportionate works, 104
state of grace, 107
he explains the case of Justus, 330
release from hell, 331
indulgences for the dead, 353
he bargains with Charles V., 386
he admits abuses, 403
projects of reform, 404
indulgence for Angelus, 444
for blessed candles, 508
Æneas of Paris, no allusion to purgatory, 309
Æneas Sylvius, defence of indulgences, 181
Aerians deny succor for the dead, 325
Agnes, Empress, absolved after death, 332
Agostino da Ancona, papal power over *culpa*, 63
emptying purgatory, 355
Ahyto of Bâle, pilgrimage to Rome, 197
Ailly, Card. d', on pardoners, 292
Alacoque, Marie, founds the Blessed Heart of Jesus, 492
Alacoque, scapular of Heart of Jesus, 499
Alan of Britanny, Carmelite general, 258
Alain de Lille foreshadows the treasure, 19
value of indulgences, 44
state of grace necessary, 106
performance of penance, 123
suffrage for the dead, 336
Albert of Jerusalem grants Carmelite Rule, 254
Albert of Mainz farms St. Peter's indulgence, 387
Luther's letter to, 392
progress of the Reformation, 398
tries another indulgence, 407
Albertus Magnus on the treasure, 23, 25
jurisdiction in indulgences, 28
indulgence cures defective penance, 31
episcopal indulgences, 37, 165
value of indulgences, 44
the treasure confers grace, 60
cumulation of partials, 91
sufficiency of cause, 96
state of grace 107
sale of indulgences, 156, 179
indulgences for the dead, 337
Albigenses, the, 372
first indulgence against, 152
forty days' service in crusade, 101
Albornoz, Card., favors the Portiuncula, 242
indulgence for his body, 283
Alcalá, C. of, condemns Pedro de Osma, 378
Alcuin on purgatory, 308
Aleander foretells the Reformation, 385
on Luther's popularity, 397
admits abuses, 402
promises reform, 407
Alexander II. on remission of penance, 13
a culpa indulgence, 55
avarice of church of Lucca, 135
indulgences ascribed to, 139
Alexander III. promises heaven, 40
promises remission of sins, 58
decides quarrel at Limoges, 136
his moderate indulgences, 145, 550
jurisdiction in indulgences, 163

Alexander IV. indulgence without conditions, 62
indulgences for Mont S. Michel, 148
indulgence for St. Peter's, 198
to confraternity of the Virgin, 471
Alexander V., his indulgence, 67
confirms the Sabbatine Bull, 272
Alexander VI., his jubilee indulgence, 73
confirms *Butterbriefe*, 193
his jubilee of 1500, 212
suspension during jubilee, 224, 226
destroys St. Patrick's Purgatory, 312
indulgences for the dead, 351
the Birgittine chaplet, 524
Alexander VII., faculty for death-bed indulgences, 168
uses Carmelite scapular, 264
on abuses of masses, 328
confirms reforms of Paul V., 461
indulgences for the Veronica, 505
transfer of indulgenced objects, 512
condemns fictitious indulgences, 557, 560
Alexandre, Noël, on the treasure, 26
Alexian Brothers opposed by the Church, 473
Alfonso XI. suppresses quæstuarii, 412
Alicante, the Santo Rostro in, 502
Almarzo, Alonso de, his fraud, 552
Alms for Holy Land, 155
for the dead, 326
in extraordinary jubilees, 231
for modern indulgences, 438
Altars, visits to, 118
as source of revenue, 135
portable, if privileged, 370
privileged, for Franciscans, 235
commencement of, 340
extension of, 352, 364, 366
formula of concession, 368
in Roman churches, 453
in Servite churches, 464
by medal of the Five Saints, 519
Altopasso, Hospital of, 292
Alumbrados, their attitude towards indulgences, 543
Amaury de Montfort, grants of redemption moneys to, 159
Ambrose, St, on future life, 302
Amendment superseded by indulgences, 35, 571
Amort, Dr., his theory of indulgences, 7
forgotten sins, 53
proportionate works, 105
disposition of penitent, 114
uncertainty of indulgences, 122
performance of penance, 127
suspension in jubilee, 219
value of prayers for the dead, 336
indulgences for the dead, 350
their multiplication, 359
Ancona, fictitious indulgence, 550
Andreucci, sufficiency of cause, 100
works are superfluous, 104
disposition of penitent, 114
Angele Dei, indulgence for, 529
Angelic chaplet of St. Michael, 526
Angelo da Clareno on the Portiuncula, 242
Angels cannot gain indulgences, 82
Angelus, indulgences for, 443
Angers, indulgences from Urban II., 141
cumulative indulgence, 171
Angiolo da Chivasso on the treasure, 26
value of indulgences, 48
indulgences *a culpa*, 73
days of penance or purgatory, 88
indulgences for the dead, 350
on confraternities, 474
Annates, 382
Anne, St., modern cult of, 493
Annibaldo, Card., in jubilee of 1350, 204
Anointed, the, their heresies, 379
Anselm describes the Holy Land, 74
Anselm of Laon on purgatory, 310
Antiquity of indulgences, 4
of jubilee, 195, 200
Antitheses of Tetzel, 395
Antoine, confession a requisite, 111
uncertainty of indulgences, 122
Antonino, St., on fraternities 17
orders unnecessary for indulgences, 29
value of indulgences, 48
indulgences *a culpa*, 72
expectation of indulgence, 83
sufficiency of cause, 97
state of grace, 108
intention to confess suffices, 110
on release from hell, 331
indulgences for the dead, 343
emptying purgatory, 355
indulgence only in *forum internum*, 402
indulgence replaces amendment, 570
Antony of Padua, his canonization, 151
Apocalypse of Paul, future life, 299
Apocryphal indulgences, fabrication of, 136, 551
Apollonio, Domingo, case of, 431
Apoplexy, privileged altars for, 100
Apostles' Symbol, communion of saints, 15
purgatory not in, 298
Apostolic Constitutions, Abraham's Bosom, 315
Apostolicæ Sedis, bull, condemns profits from indulgences, 441
Aquileia, C. of, 1596, enforces reform, 424
Aquinas on constitution of treasure, 25
payment to God from the treasure, 27
indulgences not sacramental, 29
supply defects in penance, 32
papal control of indulgences, 37
value of indulgences, 46

Aquinas, state of grace necessary, 61, 107
toties quoties indulgences, 92
sufficiency of cause, 96
proportionate payment, 103
vicarious performance, 116
his canonization, 151
sale of indulgences, 156
opposes the Carmelites, 259
local purgatory, 306
judgment immediate, 316
the resurrection, 318
release of Trajan from hell, 329
suffrages for the damned, 334
indulgences for the dead, 338
Arcemboldi, commissioner of St. Peter's indulgence, 386
his knaveries, 392
his rapacity, 400
his indulgences in *forum externum*, 403
Archconfraternities of Rome, 478
Argyrus buys fraternity of Farfa, 17
Arles, C. of 1234, on confraternities, 472
1251, on confraternities, 473
Armilausa, 263
Arnoul of Flanders, 56
Arras, the *Sainte Chandelle* at, 509
Arsenius St. asks masses for his soul, 324
Art stimulated by indulgences, 581
Asiatic Catholics, indulgences for, 533
Association de la Propagation de la Foi, 440
Assisi, interdict on, 242
grant to churches of, 247
Astesanus on value of indulgences, 47
cumulation of partials, 92
consent of confessor, 105
performance of works, 117
episcopal indulgences, 166
spiritual indulgences, 202
emptying purgatory, 355
Attigny, C. of, 765, masses exchanged in, 327
Auctorem fidei, Bull, 25, 33
on Limbus Puerorum, 304
indulgences for the dead, 355
on indulgences, 548
Augsberg, Diet of, 1518, on indulgences, 295
Augustin, St. on future life, 303
his stoicism, 324
succor for the dead, 325
has mass sung for his mother, 326
relief from damnation, 329
Augustin, Pseudo, on communion of saints, 16
on merits of the Church, 19
on purgatory, 307, 310
no succor for the dead, 335
Augustinian confraternity of Cincturati, 495
churches, indulgence for, 464
Augustinian Hermits allowed to exist on sufferance, 259
their forgeries, 556
Auto-de-fé, indulgence for presence at, 178
Ave Maria, indulgence for reciting, 183
at sound of clock, 566
formulas of, 444
Avignon, C. of, 1282, on confraternities, 473
1326, indulgences granted, 187
Azpilcueta on utilizing indulgence, 35
indulgences *a culpa*, 79
expectation of pardon, 82, 571
days of penance or purgatory, 89
power of general councils, 170
episcopal cumulation, 176
suspension during jubilee, 224
indulgences for the dead, 354
state of grace, 360
abuses of quæstuarii, 423
on reforms of Pius V., 425
on indulgenced objects, 509

BAENA, indulgence granted to, 284
Bâle, C of, indulgence issued by, 69, 83, 169
its terms for indulgences, 179
does not restrain pardoners, 292
indulgences for the dead, 342
complaints as to confraternities, 474
Banquets of confraternities, 474, 475
Baptism of living for the dead, 322
of blood, 373
Bar, Count of, redemptions given to, 160
Baronius, early moderation of indulgences, 550
Bartoli, Francesco, legend of Portiuncula, 236
Bartolommeo da Pisa on the Portiuncula, 244, 248
indulgence for the dead, 341
Bay, Michael, his error as to indulgences, 26
Beads, use of, 523
privileged, 367
of Juan de la Cruz, 566
Beatific Vision is immediate, 317
Beaumont of Paris, new devotion by, 480
Bec, dedication of abbey, 163
Beccarelli, his heresy, 545
Bede, pilgrimage to Rome, 196
does not recognize purgatory, 307
mentions the Sudarium, 502
Beggars empowered to grant indulgences, 188
Beggary, restricted by cruzada, 222, 427
of the confraternities, 478
Belief, popular, in indulgences *a culpa*, 61 63, 72, 74, 76

Bellarmine on the nature of the treasure, 26
indulgence is payment and absolution, 30
definition of indulgence, 39
indulgences *a culpa*, 79
expectation of pardon, 85
days of penance or purgatory, 90
sufficiency of cause, 99
state of grace, 108, 109
disposition of penitent, 113
emptying purgatory, 356
penance better than indulgences, 574
Belmosto family, indulgence for, 141
Benedetto d'Arezzo testifies to the Portiuncula, 240
Benedict VIII, indulgence ascribed to, 138
Benedict IX., indulgence ascribed to, 139
Benedict XI. confirms Servite privileges, 557
Benedict XII. on divine vision, 317
chaplet of Seven Sorrows, 525
Benedict XIII., indulgence for S. Maria de Cella, 102
exception to suspension, 222, 227
omissions in his jubilee, 229
confirms Carmelite legend, 262
confirms Carmelite Office, 266
grants privileged altars, 365
indulgence for Angelus, 444
indulgence for *Via Crucis*, 466
confirms the Blessed Heart of Jesus, 492
acts of Faith, Hope and Charity, 529
indulgence for ejaculations, 530
indulgence for St. Luigi Gonzaga, 532
Benedict XIV., penance before absolution, 8
culpa of venials, 79
indulgence without conditions, 80
indulgence at canonizations, 80
jubilee is *toties quoties*, 93
requires communion, 111
performance of penance, 126
on death-bed plenaries, 168
suspension during jubilee, 221, 222, 225, 228
on the Portiuncula, 244
grant to Observantine churches, 246
supports the Conventuals, 250
caution as to Sabbatine Bull, 275
confirms indulgences of Lateran, 280, 453
indulgence for Knights of Malta, 439
limits Lateran communications, 455
revises Tertiary indulgences, 462
indulgences for Augustinian churches, 464
his Golden Bull, 491
medal of St. Benedict, 520
toties quoties crucifix, 523
the Birgittine chaplet, 524
Benedict XIV., chaplet of Jeanne de Valois, 525
indulgence for mental prayer, 529
for St. Luigi Gonzaga, 532
for aiding sick in hospitals, 535
for crowned heads, 542
tests for fictitious indulgences, 562
Benedictine medal, 520
Benedictines, no general indulgences, 557
Benedictions, indulgences at, 104, 541
Benevento privilege of archbishops, 167
jubilee in 1475, 211
Benevolence, works of, indulgences for, 188, 537
Benincasa, Ursula, invents blue scapular, 498
Bequeathing indulgenced objects, 513
Berengaria, indulgenced prayer for, 184
Beringer, indulgences are absolutions, 31
supply defects of penance, 34
in forma ecclesiæ, 68
disposition of penitent, 115
state of grace, 363
sale of indulgenced objects, 514
influence of indulgences, 569
Bernard, St., promises full pardon, 43
accepts purgatory, 310
Berrocosa, profits of cruzada, 432
Berthold of Chiemsee on remission of *culpa*, 77, 78
indulgences for the dead, 353
admits abuses, 401
Berthold of Regensburg, indiscreet indulgences, 293
Bertrand of Metz, his indulgence, 164
Bethlehem, indulgences at, 74, 147
Beziers, C. of, 1351, indulgences granted, 187
Bianchi on nature of indulgence, 27
plena and *plenissima*, 43
days of penance or purgatory, 90
two plenaries a day, 94
sufficiency of cause, 99
disposition of penitent, 114
performance of penance, 126
suspension in jubilees, 221
advantages of Portiuncula, 247
multiplication of indulgences for the dead, 361
indulgences for money, 442
reckless lavishness, 443
justifies profusion, 573
abuse of indulgences, 575
evil of annual indulgences, 576
Biel, Gabriel, on deficient penance, 32
indulgences *a culpa*, 73
carina indulgence, 87
altar of St. Praxeda, 344
indulgences for the dead, 350
Birgitta, St, value of indulgences, 47
indulgences *a culpa*, 64

Birgitta, St., urges jubilee of 1350, 202
on the Portiuncula, 243
description of purgatory, 317
indulgences for the dead, 340
indulgences of Roman churches, 449
her chaplet, 523
Bishops, their indulgences limited by Lateran council, 14, 163
granting indulgences restricted to, 28
their ancient power over indulgences, 36
become deputies of pope, 37
their *toties quoties* indulgences, 92
their jurisdiction, 96
indulgence at their benedictions, 104, 541
their indulgences, 162
as *legati nati*, 166
death-bed indulgences, 167
papal faculties for, 167
elude the Lateran canons, 170
cumulate their powers, 171
share profits of pardoners, 292
cannot grant indulgences for the dead, 357
they publish indulgences, 418
administer the cruzada, 434
investigate abuses, 421
their supervision of indulgences, 444, 559, 563
supervise confraternities, 471
French, their remonstrance in 1869, 82, 548, 568
Black Death, indulgences in, 64
Blanche of Castile, indulgence for, 191
Blasphemy, indulgence to suppress, 283
Blessed Heart of Jesus, 492
of Mary, 493
Blessing indulgenced objects, 517
Blue Scapular, see Scapular
Bogliasco, his book placed on the Index, 247
Bohemia, troubles over indulgences, 68
crusade against the Prutheni, 158
sale of jubilee for, 182
Wickliffite doctrines in, 357
Bologna, jubilee in 1475, 211
C. of, 1547, indulgences *a culpa*, 79
on indulgences, 411
forbids fixed price for indulgence, 419
Bombelli, his prints of the *Via Crucis*, 468
Bonaventura on payment to God from the treasure, 27
value of indulgences, 46
on devotion in indulgences, 52
sufficiency of cause, 96
local purgatory, 306
description of purgatory, 314
the resurrection, 318
indulgences for the dead, 337
Bonaventura founds a confraternity, 472
Boniface VIII. ignores the treasure, 24
commissions to grant indulgences, 38
promises *plenissima* indulgence, 41
promises remission of sins, 59
terms of his jubilee, 63
proportions the work, 102
proportionate payment, 103
his moderate indulgences, 149
enforces Lateran canon, 166
prohibits episcopal cumulation, 173
indulgence for S. Spirito in Saxia, 190
his stations of Rome, 199
his jubilee, 199
pilgrims dying on the road, 338
indulgence to St. Maria della Pace, 554
Boniface IX withdraws indulgences, 63
his trade in indulgences, 65
his jubilee for Bohemia, 182
feast of Visitation of Mary, 187
his jubilee of 1390, 207
extends Portiuncula indulgence, 239, 244
Boniface of Ravenna, his indulgences, 166
Boniface, St., pilgrimage to Rome, 196
on purgatory, 308
Bonagrazia forbids alms to the Portiuncula, 241
Bonifazio de' Amanati on the Portiuncula, 243, 341
Boppard, inscription of, 258
Bonnes âmes, invocation of, 362
Bordeaux, treatment of papal indulgence, 179
C. of 1255, on confraternities, 473
Cordigeri suppressed, 477
Borromeo, S. Carlo, value of indulgences, 49
performance of penance, 125
suspension during jubilee, 224
on the cruzada, 420
seeks to correct abuses, 445
Bourges, indulgence for seminary of, 441
Bourgoing, profits of cruzada, 432
Bouvier on indulgence without absolution, 31
definition of indulgence, 39
years and quarantines, 87
sufficiency of cause, 101
intention of penitent, 120
performance of penance, 129
Sabbatine Bull, 276
exaggerated partials, 279
value of indulgences for the dead, 358
state of grace, 363
episcopal supervision, 445
substitute for rosary, 510
sale of indulgenced objects, 513
Brahminism, succor for the dead, 320
Brandan, St., his voyages, 310
Brandt, Sebast., on pardoners, 380

Brethren of the Cross, the, 373
Bridges, indulgences to build, 177
Brigg o' Dread, 313
Bruno of Langres, indulgence ascribed to, 137
Bruno of Minden, indulgence ascribed to, 139
Bruweiler, its quæstuarii, 285
Budé on confraternities, 479
Bugeau, Marshal, wears a medal, 522
Bula de Difuntos, 359
de lacticinios, 426
de la Candela, 508
Bull-fights, indulgences for, 542
Burchard's Diary, morals of Rome, 384
Burgundy, opposition to indulgences, 377
Burial in Franciscan habit, 554
Burning heretics, indulgence for, 178
Bursfeld Benedictines obtain Stations of Rome, 449
Busenbaum, indulgences are absolutions, 30
definition of indulgence, 39
alms for jubilee, 429
Butterbriefe, 193
sold by Frederic the Wise, 389

CÆSARIUS of Heisterbach on quæstuarii, 285
on prayers for the damned, 334
Cahensly, Herr, 483
Caietano, Jacopo, recognizes the treasure, 24
jubilee of 1300, 200, 202
Caietano, Thomas, no early evidence of indulgences, 4
on the treasure, 26
indulgences not sacramental, 29
enjoined penance, 32
disposition for indulgence, 35
explains *in forma ecclesiæ*, 68
indulgences *a culpa*, 76
popular error as to *culpa*, 78
sufficiency of cause, 97
state of grace, 107, 108
disposition of penitent, 113
uncertainty of indulgences, 121
performance of penance, 124
indulgences *vs.* charity, 188
benefit of masses, 328
indulgences for the dead, 352
restrains Adrian VI., 404
indulgences do not amend, 571
Calatayud, cumulative indulgences at, 173, 174
Calixtus III. decides quarrel at Fécamp, 136
grants a cruzada, 161
indulgences for Franciscans, 235
Calixtus III. indulgence for the dead, 344
Camaldulensian chaplet, 524
Cambrai, C. of, 1565, on false indulgences, 559
Campeggio discountenances disputation, 396
his projected reform, 408
restricts confraternities, 475
Candles, burning, for the dead, 338
blessed, indulgenced, 508
Cano Melchor, on evils of cruzada, 414
Canonizations, indulgences at, 80, 150
in forma ecclesiæ, 68
indulgenced objects, 518
Canterbury, indulgence for, 147
jubilee attempted at, 208
Cantor, Peter, Roman indulgences, 198
Capoli, Giov., testifies to the Portiuncula, 240
Capreolus, John, papal power over *culpa*, 67
Capuchins claim the *Via Crucis*, 466
Caravaca, cross of, 565
Cardinals, indulgences claimed by, 74
their power to grant indulgences, 168
cumulative indulgences by, 174
Carina, 87
Carlos III. regulates confraternities, 479
Carlos IV. recognizes the cruzada, 432
Carlstein, indulgence for, 278
Carmelite Chapter, indulgences granted to, 71
churches, *toties quoties* indulgence, 95
Scapular, its origin, 263
its form and material, 264
ensures salvation, 267
as an amulet, 269
works of mercy indulgenced, 535
Carmelites, their liberality, 18
their origin and development, 253
their forgeries, 255
they abandon Palestine, 258
allowed to exist on sufferance, 259
obtain confirmation, 261
their Sabbatine Bull, 270
their indulgences, 276
their fictitious indulgences, 555
condemned, 556
Carranza, Angela, her beads, 514
Carranza, Archbishop, indifferent to indulgences, 543
Carton-madéra for indulgenced objects, 511
Casa di Refugio, indulgence for, 440, 535
Casamaria, indulgence for, 147
Castile, complaints of cruzada, 413
Castro, Alf. de, no early evidence of indulgences, 4
Catalonia, complaints of cruzada, 413
Cataracts of indulgences, 233
Catechism of 1545 on purgatory, 314
on judgment, 317

Caterino, Ambr., on the treasure, 21
on remission of *culpa*, 77
sufficiency of cause, 98
emptying purgatory, 356
abuse of indulgences, 571
Cathari, first indulgence against, 152
their dualism, 372
crushed by indulgences, 581
Cathedrals, privileged altars of, 365
Catholic writers, disadvantage of, 391
explanation of the Reformation, 398
Catholicism, its promises of salvation, 579
Cause of indulgences, 46, 96
Cava, fictitious indulgence to, 140
Cazalla, Maria, popular error as to *culpa*, 78
her trial, 543
Celerinus asks intercession of martyrs, 6
Cellites, opposed by the Church, 473
Cemeteries, indulgences for, 140
Cenci, Beatrice, case of, 90
Centum Gravamina, the, 401
Certainty of indulgences for the dead, 357
Certificates of liberation from purgatory, 369
Ceyro on Portuguese cruzada, 436
Chaimis, Bart. de, on stipend for masses, 328
Chain of St Peter, 516
Chambéry, the *lenzuolo* in, 503
Champigny, C. of, 1238, on confraternities, 473
Chandor, Bridge, 307
Chapels, private, indulgences for, 284
Chaplet, the Apostolic, 523
of St. Birgitta, 523
of the Five Saints, 519
of Jesus Christ, 524
of Seven Sorrows of the Virgin, 525
of Jeanne de Valois, 525
of the Five Wounds, 525
of the Precious Blood, 525
of St. Michael, 526
of the Sacred Heart of Mary, 526
of Immaculate Heart of Virgin, 539
Chaplets, materials for, 510
when broken, 511
indulgenced, 517, 523
Chapters, their power to grant indulgences, 37
Franciscan, Portiuncula for, 244
Charlemagne, his visits to Rome, 196
Charles IV. (Emp.) indulgence for him, 278
Charles V. bargains with Adrian VI., 386
restrains questuarii, 413
his reform measures, 417
suppresses a confraternity, 476
his fleet saved by a blessed candle, 508
Charles IX. (France) regulates confraternities, 476
Charles the Lame, indulgenced prayer for, 185
Charity, performance of works in, 109
works of, indulgences for, 188, 534
confraternities for, 482
Charlier, Gilles, on the treasure, 12
indulgences *a culpa*, 71
sale of indulgences, 179
on pardoners, 292
Charmes de, disposition of penitent, 114
performance of penance, 128
Charters, forgery of, 137
Chartres, C. of, 1526, on confraternities, 475
Cheron, Jean, his defence of the scapular, 265
Chests for money for indulgences, 159, 179
Chichely of Canterbury publishes a jubilee, 208
Chiericato (Cherigeri) performance of penance, 127
Children, indulgences for, 81
Chiliasts, 302
China, Marian congregations in, 491
fictitious indulgences in, 558
Chinvat, Bridge, 307
Christ, merits of, in indulgences, 23
grants Portiuncula indulgence, 237
height of, wounds of, etc., 566
Christian doctrine, indulgences for teaching, 536
Christianity saved by indulgences, 574
Christian I. rebuilds S. Spirito in Saxia, 190
Chrysostom on community of Christians, 16
on pilgrimage to Rome, 196
on future life, 300
masses for the dead, 324
relief from damnation, 329
Choice of confessor in jubilee, 228
denied to regulars, 573
Church, its intercessory powers, 8
is always the "poor," 231
attitude towards benevolence, 537
retrospect of its career, 582
Churches, dedications of, indulgences for, 142
parish, have privileged altars, 366
their real and false indulgences, 558
of Religious Orders, their indulgences, 464
Cincturati, 495
Ciruelo on stationarii, 423
Claudius of Turin on pilgrimage, 196
Claves excellentiæ, 29
Clement III. includes forgotten sins, 53
promises remission of sins, 59
indulgence for a bridge, 177
Clement IV. indulgence without conditions, 62

Clement IV., indulgence for Franciscan habit, 278
represses pardoners, 286
Clement V. promises remission of sins, 59
his moderate indulgences, 149
authorizes redemption of vows, 160
faculties granted to legates, 169
remission proportioned to payment, 179
prayers indulgenced by, 185
personal indulgences, 191
Clement VI. adopts the treasure, 24, 25
indulgence attributed to, 64
extends the jubilee, 65
sufficiency of cause, 96
mitigation of fasts, 193
his jubilee of 1350, 202
his forged jubilee bull, 203, 347, 349, 596
condemns the Flagellants, 373
canonizes St Ivo, 151
Clement VII., indulgences without conditions, 78
uses the golden hammer, 212
his jubilee of 1525, 214
suspends indulgences in jubilee, 226
Portiuncula granted by Holy See, 248
procession renewed, 251
limits the Sabbatine Bull, 273
abstains from indulgences for the dead, 354
his promises of reform, 405
indulgences for the rosary, 486
for blessed candles, 508
confirms Franciscan forgeries, 554
Clement VIII. indulgence without conditions, 80
antiquity of jubilee, 200
his jubilee of 1600, 216
suspends indulgences in jubilee, 220, 225, 226
liberation of souls, 354
visit to the Sacrament, 456
indulgences of Religious Orders, 460
reforms confraternities, 477
charity in his jubilee, 482
favors the rosary, 487
forty hours' prayer, 529
indulgence for *Ecce Ego*, 530
rebukes Order of Merced, 557
restricts Jesuits, 573
Clement IX. founds Congregation of Indulgences, 560
Clement X. suspension during jubilee, 221, 227
confirms Carmelite indulgences, 275
confirms the blue scapular, 498
indulgenced objects, 518
canonization of S. Giuseppe da Cupertino, 518
the chaplet of Jesus Christ, 524
confirms indulgence of Cincturati, 556
Clement XI., grant of plenaries, 246
suspends the cruzada, 431
alms for indulgences, 439
extends feast of rosary, 488
indulgences for blue scapular, 498
the Birgittine chaplet, 524
war of Spanish Succession, 538
Clement XII. plenary for St. Peter's, 456
chaplet of Seven Sorrows, 525
indulgence for S. Luigi Gonzaga, 532
for *Dottrina Cristiana*, 536
Clement XIII. requires confession, 112
privileged altars in parish churches, 366
indulgence for ejaculations, 530
Clement XIV. exhorts to repentance, 217
indulgence for Trisagion, 529
Clergy welcome the Reformation, 394, 406
Clerics not to win indulgences, 570
Clermont, C. of 1095, indulgence granted at, 9
is remission of sin, 57
Clock, Ave at sound of, 566
Cloquet on fictitious indulgences, 567
Cluniac Order, its fraternity, 17
Cluny, indulgence for, 145
Cnut, his pilgrimage to Rome, 196
Cochlæus on Luther as a disputant, 391
explains the Reformation, 398
Cœlestin III., crusading indulgences for money, 155
forgery of papal letters, 551
Cœlestin V., his indulgence, 63
Cœna Domini cases released in jubilee, 42
Collection of debts for indulgences, 414, 428
Collegia, 470
Collemadio, church of, indulgence for, 63
Colloredo, Archbishop, abuses of indulgences, 545
crowds seeking indulgences, 577
Cologne, price of jubilee for, 182
Commission on sales of indulgences, 426
Commissioners punished by Boniface IX., 66
of John XXIII., their frauds, 68
Communication of indulgences, 454
Communion as a requisite, 112
Communion of saints, 15
Community of merits, 19
Commutation of penance, indulgence is, 11
of crusading vows, 154
of vows in jubilee, 229
Compactata, indulgences not mentioned, 377
Competition for funerals, 327
Compostella, indulgences for, 141
no early indulgences, 143
on a par with Rome, 144
indulgences granted at, 162
forged bull of jubilee, 208
C. of, 1114, masses exchanged in, 327

Compulsion to purchase indulgences, 412, 416, 430
Computation of partials, 85
Conception, Blue Scapular of, 80, 498
feast of the, 539
Concessions of indulgences, sale of, 182
Conclave of 1503, indulgences at, 74
Concordats framed at Constance, 294
Confession of faith, obligatory, 5
Confession, general, at C. of Clermont, 10
not necessary for indulgence, 62
eluded in indulgences, 69
condition of, 110, 111
Confessional letters, 70, 83, 191
their price, 349, 595
Confessor, his consent necessary, 105
choice of, in jubilee, 228
utility of indulgences to, 572
Confraternities in aid of Inquisition, 78
for St. Peter's, 410
their privilege of begging, 440
regulated by the Church, 470
their excesses, 474
used for selling indulgences, 474, 475, 478
reformed by Clement VIII., 478
stimulated by Pius IX , 481
for charitable objects, 482
for political objects, 483
for pious exercises, 484
cumulative indulgences, 500
Confraternity of the Holy Ghost, 190
of the Virgin of Mount Carmel, 265, 556
of St. Lazarus, 442
of St. Joseph and the Via Crucis, 468
del Confalone, 471
of the Blessed Virgin, 471
of St. Nicholas, 471
di Santa Maria, 472
of S. Gibrien, 472
SS. Præputii, 472
for cult of Virgin, 474
of Hosp. of S Lazarus, 475
of S. Lievind, 476
of *Cordigeri*, 477
of St. Jerome, 477
della Misericordia, 479, 482
of scriveners, 481
of tailors, 482
della Pietà, 482
della SS. Trinita, 482
Society of St. Raphael, 483
the Leonine Society, 483
of St. Michael, 483
of the rosary, 484
Jesuit, of the Blessed Virgin, 490
of Assumption of the Virgin, 492
of Blessed Heart of Jesus, 492
of Blessed Heart of Mary, 493
of St Joseph, 494
of Holy Family, 494
Confraternity of Cord of St. Joseph, 494
of *Cincturati*, 495, 556
of Seven Sorrows of Mary, 496
of Precious Blood of Jesus Christ, 499
of *Sacro Volto*, 501
of *S. Spirito in Saxia*, 504
of *la Sainte Face*, 505
of *Nuestra Señora del Rosario*, 508
des Ardents, 509
of Chain of St. Peter, 516
of Merced, 557
of S. Leonardo, 561
Congregation of the Council of Trent on the Portiuncula, 250
on masses, 328
Congregation of indulgences, its organization, 560
on *toties quoties* indulgences, 94
evades decision as to penance, 128
enforces limitation on bishops, 167
on death-bed plenaries, 168
forbids cumulative indulgences, 176
letters of indulgence, 192
cruzada suspends indulgences, 223
regulates the Portiuncula, 245, 249
on Carmelite scapular, 264
the Sabbatine Bull, 274
state of grace, 363
privileged masses, 369, 370
begging confraternities, 440
episcopal supervision, 446
simplifies Stations of Rome, 451
reforms Stations of Rome 452
limits abuse of communication, 455
churches of Religious Orders, 463
regulates *Via Crucis*, 467
restricts confraternities, 478
devotion to the Trinity, 480
the rosary, 484, 487
indulgenced objects, 509
their materials, 510
their transfer, 512
their sale, 513
Holy Land objects, 516
crucifixes of Pius VII., 521
decades of chaplets, 524
rosary of the Holy Cross, 526
indulgences for new prayers, 531
family indulgences, 542
Franciscan frauds, 554
Carmelite indulgence, 556
condemns forged indulgences, 556, 557, 558, 561, 563, 565
indulgences to be recorded, 562
its inaccuracy, 567
Congregation of Inquisition restricts Portiuncula, 246
Congregation of Missions, indulgences for, 462
Congregation of Rites on Vision of Simon Stock, 266

Consent of confessor required, 105
Consilium de emendanda Ecclesia, 293, 409
Constance, C. of, accuses John XXIII., 30
reform attempted by, 70
indulgenced prayers for Sigismund, 186
Constance, indulgence to church of, 75
Contarini, Card., on sale of indulgences, 409
Contarini, Gasparo, on the cruzada, 413
Contrition unnecessary for indulgence, 62
Conventuals, quarrels with Observantines, 250
Correns, early indulgence at, 138
Councils, general, their power to grant indulgences, 169
Cord of St. Joseph, 494
Corde contritis et ore confessis, 60
Corinthian sinner, his pardon, 5
Corpus Christi, feast of, 59, 187
Corrado of Assisi on the Portiuncula, 242
Cotton forbidden in scapulars, 264
Counter-Reformation, 417
its results, 584
Credit sales of indulgences, 414, 428
Creed, communion of saints in the, 15
Creeds, purgatory not alluded to, 298
Crocesegnati, 178, 472
Crociata, origin of, 161
in Naples, 85, 436
Crosses used in *Via Crucis*, 468
indulgenced, 517
of Monserrat, 519
of Caravaca, 565
Crowds of penitents, influence of, 576
Crowns, blessed, 523
Crucifixes, material for, 511
of Pius VII., 521
toties quoties, 522
Crusade indulgences at Clermont, 10
their price, 155, 159, 161
fasts mitigated, 193
Crusade of Leo X., 385
of Pius V., 438
Crusaders, promises made to, 40, 43
dying on the road, 116
term of service of, 152
unwilling, excommunicated, 155
their money preferred, 157
Crusades stimulate indulgences, 152
their use to the Holy See, 153
their financial utility, 154, 160
supported by indulgences, 582
Cruzada, origin of, 161
partial and plenary combined, 91
is *toties quoties*, 93
mitigation of fasting, 194
not suspended in jubilees, 222
Charles V. and Adrian VI., 387
its profits, 412, 429, 431, 434
shared by Holy See, 387, 427, 433, 436
Cruzada, its abuses, 413, 430
papal effort to reform, 420, 426
system of its sale, 428, 434
annual sales of, 435
Culpa, power of indulgences over, 31, 54, 435
papal power over, 63, 67, 77
et Pœna, influence on doctrine of purgatory, 336
Cum postquam, bull, 77
Cumulation of indulgences, 91
of episcopal indulgences, 171
of indulgenced objects, 527
Curia, the, its exactions, 384
Cyprian on intercession of martyrs, 5
merits of saints, 15
destiny of the soul, 298
masses for the dead, 323
Cyprian of Sarenthal, his *Via Crucis*, 465
Cyprus, indulgence for war in, 180
Cyril, pseudo, defends purgatory, 306

DAGOBERT I. released from hell, 330
Damnation, relief from, 329
Damned, the, injured by prayer, 334
Daniel of Nantes, indulgence for mass, 187
Dante on jubilee indulgence, 63
jubilee of 1300, 201
the *Limbus Patrum*, 303
Dauphiné, confraternities suppressed, 476
Day of Judgment, doctrine of, 297
loses its importance, 318
Days of penance or purgatory, 86, 88
Dead, the, their estates liable for vows, 158
indulgences for, suspended in jubilee, 225
efficacy of Portiuncula, 248, 341
succor for the, 318
first indulgence for, 345
suffrage, not jurisdiction, 337, 346
Death-bed, plenaries for, 167
suspended in jubilee, 225, 227
lighted candles at, 508
Deaths at the Portiuncula, record of, 251
Debtors to the cruzada, 414, 428
Decree of Union on immediate judgment, 317
Dedications of churches, indulgences for, 142
Definitions of indulgence, 39
Demand for indulgences *a culpa*, 61
Demoralization caused by indulgences, 570
Denhoff, his pastoral instruction, 111
Dens, Peter, release from hell, 330
Des Genettes revives the Blessed Heart of Mary, 493
Development of indulgences, 131

Devotion, its effect on indulgence, 45, 52, 113
indulgences for acts of, 184, 529
Diana, days of penance or purgatory, 90
sufficiency of cause, 99
proportionate payment, 103
disposition of penitent, 113
visits to altars, 118
certainty of indulgences for the dead, 358
on intention in privileged masses, 370
Dinocrates, case of, 322
Dies utiles or *continui*, 86
Dionysius of Alexandria on martyrs, 6
Dionysius, pseudo, on future life, 305
Diptychs, use of, 323, 326
Discretion of priest, indulgences originate in, 11
Disposition of penitent, 112
Dominic, St, his canonization, 151
rosary attributed to, 484, 486
Dominicans, their indulgences 148, 236
Portiuncula granted to, 245
rosary belongs to, 487
their forgeries, 555
Doney, Archbishop, on scapulars, 265
Doomsday, see *Day of Judgment*.
Döringk, Matthias, on indulgences, 180
Dorotheus, St., on future life, 305
Dottrina Cristiana, indulgences for, 536
Dubois, Pierre, on cardinals, 174
Dudík on indulgence tablets. 76
Duplication of indulgences, 50
Dupont, Léon, devotion of the Veronica, 506
Durand de S. Pourçain on the treasure, 25
orders requisite to indulgences, 29
value of indulgences, 47
papal power over *culpa*, 63
works not required, 104
performance of penance, 124
indulgences for the dead. 339
Durand, William, ignores the treasure, 23
value of indulgences, 46
cumulation of partials, 91
toties quoties indulgences, 93
performance of penance, 124
jurisdiction in indulgences, 171
on pardoners, 289
Dykes, indulgence for repair of, 283

ECK, Dr. and the Leipzig disputation, 395
explains the Reformation, 403
Ecclesiastics not to win indulgences, 570
Echan cornos, 426
Echo du Purgatoire, 362
Edict of Worms, 397
Edward I. favors the Carmelites, 260
Edward II. asks confirmation of Carmelites, 260
his grants to Carmelites, 261
Efficacy of indulgences, 44
for the dead, 357
Eggs in fasts, 192
Egypt, intercession of martyrs in, 6
succor for the dead, 320
Einsiedlen, its indulgence, 134
claims exemption from suspension, 223
Ejaculations, indulgences for, 530
Eleemosynary indulgences restricted by Pius V., 424
modern, 438
Elijah the earliest anchorite, 253
was a Christian, 256
Elizabeth, St., her canonization, 151
Eloi St. on merits of saints, 15
on purgatory, 306
En Ego, indulgence for, 530
England, indulgences for churches, 149
crusading moneys collected, 158
Saxon, pilgrimage to Rome, 196
sale of jubilee in 1500, 214
Catholics provided for in jubilee of 1575, 215
prayers for, 538
concordat at Constance, 294
St. Peter's indulgence not preached, 387
indulgence for conversion of, 539
Enkenvöert, Datary of Adrian VI., 405
Erani, 470
Erasmus, effects of indulgences, 76
his influence, 380
on confraternities, 476
Erfurt, revolt against the clergy, 398
Eriath, case of, 131
Eschatology of early Church, 296
Escobar, performance of penance, 126
Espen, van, antiquity of jubilee, 195
Est, Willem van, on remission of sin, 27
indulgences are of the external forum, 29
indulgences are absolution, 30
value of indulgences, 49
sufficiency of cause, 99
proportionate payment, 103
Estimates of indulgences, 44, 180
Etruscans, succor for the dead, 321
Eudes of Paris excommunicates unwilling crusaders, 155
on confraternities, 471
Eugenius III., his promises, 40, 58
toties quoties indulgence, 92
indulgence for Pistoja, 145
Eugenius IV., indulgence *a culpa*, 71
his term for indulgences, 179
indulgences for Corpus Christi, 187
sells letters of indulgence, 191
indulgences for the dead, 342

Eugenius IV., indulgence to confraternity, 472
Euphrasius St., carries the Veronica to Spain, 502
Evagrius on future life, 304
Evidence of indulgences, no early, 4
Exceptions to suspension in jubilees, 222
Excommunication of unwilling crusaders, 155
Ex opere operato, 113, 120
Expectation of indulgence, influence of, 83
Expectatives, 381
Explanations of indulgences, 20
of indulgences *a culpa*, 79
of the Reformation, 398
Exposition of Holy Coat of Trèves, 515

FABRI, JOHANN, on Luther, 378
sales of indulgences, 380
Faculties, papal, for bishops, 167
for blessing objects, 517
Faith, obligatory confession of, 5
in pardon a requisite, 113
Hope and Charity, acts of, 529
Families, indulgences for, 542
Fano, Giov. da, on the treasure, 22
Farfa, abbey of, grants fraternity, 17
its indulgence, 139
Fasting, letters to mitigate, 192
Fécamp, struggle for oblations at, 136
Fees for writs of indulgence, 183
for letters of indulgence, 191
Fénelon, almsgiving in jubilee, 232
limits indulgences, 574
Ferdinand I., Emp. on the annates, 382
Ferdinand St. uses the Sudarium, 502
Ferdinand and Isabella restrain questuarii, 412
Ferdinand VI. (Spain) reorganizes the cruzada, 432
Ferdinand IV. (Naples) obtains the crociata, 436
Ferrara, indulgence to church of, 550
Ferraris on the treasure, 22
quadragena and *carina*, 87
days of penance or purgatory, 90
toties quoties indulgences, 94
sufficiency of cause, 100
confession not required, 111
performance of medicinal penance, 126
emptying purgatory, 356
state of grace, 361
certainty of privileged masses, 369
list of Stations of Rome, 451
indulgences of Roman churches, 453
indulgenced objects, 511
indulgence for hearing mass, 533
Feyjoo, belief in indulgences, 50
equality of remission, 53
Feyjoo, sufficiency of cause, 100
Fictitious indulgences, 552
Filippo Neri, S., organizes the *Trinità*, 482
First resurrection, 302
Fisher of Rochester on origin of indulgences, 3
Five Saints, medal of, 519
Fixed price for indulgence, 419, 442
Flagellants, the, their sacrament, 373
Florence, Carmelite forgery, 257
C. of, 1439, on immediate judgment, 317
indulgences for the dead, 342
1786, on indulgences, 546
Ford, Richard, indulgences for bull-fights, 542
Forgeries, frequency of, 137
of indulgences, 553
Forgotten sins, indulgence for, 53
Formulas of indulgences, 60
for cumulative indulgences, 175
papal, of indulgences, 36
of Reformation, 417
of sermons for pardoners, 389
Forner, jubilee is *a culpa*, 80
Forty days, indulgences of, 86
hours' prayer, 529
Forum externum, absolution in, 402
Foulques de Neuilly preaches the crusade, 285
France, remonstrance of bishops in 1869, 82, 548, 568
opposition to indulgences, 377
St. Peter's indulgence not preached, 387
spread of Reformation, 406
questuarii restrained, 416
ineffectiveness of Tridentine reform, 425
episcopal supervision, 445
excesses of confraternities, 476
Francis de Paula, indulgence of, 95
Francis St., his canonization, 151
obtains Portiuncula indulgence, 237
excludes laymen from Portiuncula, 238
adoration of, 252
Franciscan chapters, Portiuncula for, 244
Churches, Portiuncula granted to, 245
Franciscans, early indulgences for, 148
indulgence from Leo X., 278
later indulgences, 235
indulgence from Sixtus IV., 450
claim exemption from reforms, 461
their *Via Crucis*, 465
their forgeries, 554
Franciscans, Spiritual, 377
Francesco di Fabriano gains the Portiuncula, 240
François I., indulgence at his coronation, 277
François II., of Britanny, on the rosary, 485
François de Mairone, source of indulgences, 23

François Mairone, state of grace, 107
on *Limbus Patrum*, 304
joys of purgatory, 314
four infernal abodes, 316
release of Trajan from hell, 329
prayers for the damned, 334
suffrage for the dead, 339
Fraternities granted by monks, 17
Fraticelli reject indulgences, 377
Frauds in sales of cruzada, 413, 431
in indulgences, 552
Frederic the Wise, his *Butterbriefe*, 193
employs Tetzel, 389
opposes St. Peter's indulgence, 394
Freisingen, pardoners at, 288
Fuggers, the, farm the annates, 382
farm St. Peter's indulgence, 388
Fulgentius of Ruspe on future life, 305
Fumo, Bart., on enjoined penance, 33
days of penance or purgatory, 89
uncertainty of indulgences, 121
performance of penance, 125
mitigation of fasting, 193
emptying purgatory, 356
Funeral rites in Greece and Rome, 320
St. Augustin deems them useless, 325
competition for, 327

GALLICAN Church, episcopal supervision, 445
Gautier de Metz on St. Patrick's Purgatory, 312
Geiler v. Keysersberg, indulgences *a culpa*, 74
on false relics, 380
Geldoniæ, 470
Gelmirez, Abp., commutes penance, 11
General indulgences reserved for bishops, 13
Geoffroi of Amiens promises remission of sins, 59
Georg of Saxony, his *Butterbriefe*, 193
Gerard of Cambrai on purgatory, 309
Gerard Odo on the Portiuncula, 242
Germany, estimate of indulgences, 180
concordat at Constance, 294
its grievances, 380
its hatred of Rome, 385, 397, 405
indulgence for imperial family, 542
fictitious indulgences, 559
Gerson, John, value of indulgences, 48
indulgences *a culpa*, 71
advantage of the rich, 103
intention to confess suffices, 110
his substitute for jubilee, 209
exaggerated partials, 280
multiplication of indulgences, 294
indulgences for the dead, 342
Giallarbru, 313
Gilbert de la Porrée denies necessity of sacrament, 333
Giraldus Cambrensis on St. Patrick's Purgatory, 311
Giunchi, belief in indulgences, 50
sufficiency of cause, 100
repentance necessary, 111
disposition of penitent, 114
Giuseppe da Cupertino, his canonization, 518
Glossator on Clementines on indulgences *a culpa*, 64
Goa, Portiuncula refused to churches, 245
God cannot liberate souls without suffrage, 354
Golden Book of Confraternities on Sabbatine Bull, 276
Grace, state of, for indulgences, 106, 360
Gracian, Jeronimo, his ransom, 189
Gradenigo, Vinc., abuses of cruzada, 430
Graffi, Jacopo, state of grace, 108
Granada, Franciscan chapel, its fraud, 554
Grants of indulgences, sale of, 182
Gratian, means of relief from purgatory, 335, 338
Gravamina nationis Germanicæ, 295
Greece, succor for the dead, 320
Greek Church, communion of saints not accepted by, 16
Greek Schism, purgatory not alluded to in, 309
Gregory I., indulgence attributed to, 3, 133
on resurrection, 301
his view of purgatory, 305
time of judgment, 315
remission of purgatory, 328
releases Trajan from hell, 329
release from hell, 330
privileged mass of, 367
his stations, 447
Gregory III., no prayers for the impious, 331
Gregory VI. offers deprecatory absolution, 142
Gregory VII., his indulgences, 56
absolves Empress Agnes after death, 332
Gregory VIII. promises eternal life, 40
discredits indulgences, 44
Gregory IX., Holy See more important than Holy Land, 153
money rather than crusaders, 157
use of redemption funds, 159
indulgences for St. Peter's, 198
silences pardoners, 290
Gregory XI. requires Friday fasting, 124
his canonizations, 151
proposes a jubilee, 206
Gregory XIII, his confession of faith, 5, 304

Gregory XIII., his *toties quoties* indulgence, 95
episcopal death-bed indulgences, 168
his jubilee of 1575, 215
suspends indulgences, 220, 224
limits the Sabbatine Bull, 273
suppresses the day of judgment, 318
grants privileged altars, 364
ascends the Scala Santa, 457
confraternity of the Virgin, 491
restricts Jesuits, 573
Gregory XV. extends the Portiuncula, 245
grants *oraculo vivæ vocis*, 461
Gregory XVI. indulgence for road building, 440
confirms the Living Rosary, 489
the Blessed Heart of Mary, 493
chaplet of the Precious Blood, 526
rosary of the Holy Cross, 526
Société de S. François Régis, 536
Gregory Card at C. of Clermont, 10
Gregory of Tours suggests purgatory, 305
Gröne, indulgence supplies defects of penance, 34
on episcopal power, 38
value of indulgences, 51
indulgences bring grace, 81
necessity of works, 105
confession and communion, 110
disposition of penitent, 115
defence of sale of indulgences, 184
multiplication of indulgences, 284
indulgences for the dead, 359
explanation of the Reformation, 399
Gueldres, Duke of, asks power to punish priests, 406
Guerric of Igny accepts purgatory, 311
Guglielmi on Sabbatine Bull, 275
Guicciardini explains the Reformation, 399
Guilds become confraternities, 481
Guillaume de Trie confirms a confraternity, 472
Guilt, power of indulgence over, 54

HABERT, repentance necessary, 111
Habit, Dominican, indulgence for kissing, 236
striped, of early Carmelites, 258
Franciscan, indulgence for burial in, 278
Hales, Alex. his theory of the treasure, 21, 25
restricts indulgences to bishops, 28
on episcopal powers, 36
sufficiency of cause, 96
proportion of work, 101
does not know the Portiuncula, 239
Hales Alex. describes purgatory, 314
indulgences for the dead, 337
Hammer, the golden, 212
Hammerstein, von, on sale of indulgences, 390
Haymo of Halberstadt on purgatory, 308
relief of the dead, 329, 331
Heart of Jesus, scapular of, 499
ejaculation of, 531
of Mary, ejaculation of, 531
Heaven, soul flies direct to, 52
Hefele on Ximenes, 386
Heilthumb fürer, 380
Heirs, their liability for crusading vows, 158
Hell, the Church relieves from, 329
it abandons control over, 332
Helping hands forbidden by Pius V., 424
Hemmerlin, Felix, on *porta santa*, 212
indulgences for the dead, 343
on the curia, 384
indulgence in *forum internum*, 402
influence of jubilee, 576
Henricians, the, 372
Henriquez, sufficiency of cause, 99
performance of penance, 127
Henry II. (France) suppresses confraternities, 476
Henry IV. (France), indulgence against, 57
suppresses confraternities, 477
Henry IV. (Castile), his cruzada, 161
Henry III. (England), crusade in his favor, 153
Henry VIII. fills up St Patrick's Purgatory, 312
Henry of Constance, indulgence for Angelus, 443
Henry of Hesse on the treasure, 26
on episcopal power, 37
uncertainty of indulgences, 97
Henry of Nantes, indulgence for mass, 187
Henry of Rebdorff on jubilee indulgence, 64
Henry of Saltrey on St. Patrick's Purgatory, 311
Henry of Susa on the treasure, 25
on orders in indulgences, 28
value of indulgences, 45
cumulation of partials, 91
performance of penance, 123
episcopal indulgences, 165
episcopal cumulation, 172
suffrages for the damned, 334
indulgences for the dead, 337
Hereford, indulgence for, 150
Heresy, its absolution in jubilee, 229
indulgences a test of, 431, 544
Heretics, use of indulgences against, 152
indulgence for capturing, 178

Hergenröther explains the Reformation, 399
Heritable indulgences, 542
Hermits, Carmelite, in Palestine, 254
Hiezing, indulgence of chapel of, 542
Hilarion, the earliest monk in Palestine, 253
Hilary of Poitiers on future judgment, 300
on purgatory, 301
Hildebert of Le Mans on purgatory, 310
relief from purgatory, 334
Hildebrand, Count, obtains fraternity, 17
Hincmar regulates confraternities, 470
Hindu succor for the dead, 320
Hippolytus, purgatory not in his creed, 298
prayers for the dead, 323
Hiring indulgenced objects, 513
Hohenstaufen defeated by indulgences, 581
Holden, Dr., doubts existence of the treasure, 24
Holy Coat of Argenteuil, 162
Holy Coat of Trèves, 380
its exposition, 515
Holy Cross, rosary of the, 526
Holy Ghost, hospital of, its indulgence, 76
Holy Land indulgences, 74, 459
plenaries for visiting, 187
objects, 515
Holy Thursday reconciliation, 8
Holy See, indulgences concentrated in, 36
evades decision as to penance, 128
its use of indulgences, 152, 282, 581
its necessities, 379
hatred of, in Germany, 385, 397, 405
its share in the cruzada, 387, 427, 433
in Naples crociata, 436
condemns fictitious indulgences, 559
influence of the treasure, 582
Holy wars of the Church, 153
Holy Water, indulgence for use of, 530
Honoré, St., celebrations for the dead, 326
Honorius II., absolution based on merits, 18
remission of sins by, 146
Honorius III. allows abbots to grant indulgences, 14
his moderate indulgences, 147
canonizes St. Lawrence O'Toole, 150
gratuitous indulgence, 189
indulgence for S. Maria Maggiore, 198
grants the Portiuncula, 237
Carmelite forgeries, 255
indulgence of Saracinesca, 552
Honorius of Autun, release from purgatory, 334
Hörmann, belief in indulgences, 51
evil of indulgences, 578
Hospitals, indulgences for, 189
indulgence for visiting, 535
Hospitallers, their quæstuarii, 286, 288
Herbert of Canterbury on unwilling crusaders, 155
Hugh of S. Victor on local purgatory, 306, 310
judgment immediate, 316
succor for the dead, 335
Hugues of Rouen, his indulgences, 162
Humbert de Romanis on pardoners, 291
Huss, John, resistance to indulgences, 68, 153, 375
Hussites oppose indulgences at Bâle, 179, 376
object to confraternities, 474
Hypotheses of origin of indulgences, 5
Hyde Abbey, its fraternities, 17

IGNORANCE, popular, as to indulgences, 51, 578
Images, indulgenced, 517
on paper not indulgenced, 510
of St. Peter, 522
Immaculate Conception, medal of, 521
indulgence for, 539
Immunity, clerical, influence of, 84
Indies, price of cruzada in, 429
Index, indulgences placed on, 560
Indulgentia, significance of, 132
Indulgences, their origin, 3
theories as to their origin, 5
granted at C. of Clermont, 10
based on merits of saints, 19
conflicting opinions as to, 20
based on the treasure, 23, 46
payment to God from the treasure, 27
not sacramental, 28
solution or absolution, 30
supply defect in penance, 31
safer than penance, 35
derived solely from the Pope, 37
definitions, 39, 77
varieties, 40
questions as to value, 43, 121
cause, 46
avert temporal misfortune, 51
influence on morality, 51, 570
on the penitent, 81
on penance, 122
affected by devotion, 52
cover forgotten sins, 53
power over *culpâ*, 54
sins committed in expectation, 83
partial, their computation, 85
cumulation of, 91
toties quoties, 92
requisites for, 96
work required, 101, 104
state of grace, 106
for works of mercy, 128, 188, 534

Indulgences for acts of devotion, 184, 529
development, 131
pecuniary value, 136
forgeries, 137, 550
early moderation, 145
influence of crusades, 152
episcopal grants, 162
cumulative, 171
various objects of, 177, 282
general use of, 178
money the chief object, 179
sale of grants, 182
personal, 191
jubilee, 195
suspension during jubilee, 211, 215, 219
excepted from suspension, 222
of jubilee, advantages of, 228
in forma jubilæi, 230
in later middle ages, 234
multiplication deprecated, 293
rejected by heretics, 372
price of St. Peter's, 390
limitless power, 393
release from justice, 402
compulsion to purchase, 412, 416, 430
sales on credit, 414, 428, 437
publication regulated by C. of Trent, 418
made *de fide* at Trent, 421
correction of abuses, 421, 445, 559
moderation enjoined at Trent, 421
injunction disregarded, 442
reforms of Pius V., 424
modern eleemosynary, 438
of Roman churches, 449, 453
of St. Peter's, 456
of Religious Orders, 460
sold by confraternities, 474, 475, 478
for the rosary, 484, 488
for confraternities, 484 sqq
for scapulars, 497
attached to objects, 507, 518
crowns and chaplets, 523
modern expansion, 528
for Asiatic Catholics, 533
for political objects, 538
attitude of mystics, 543
fictitious, lists of, 561
persistence of, 564
influence in history, 581
Indulgences for the dead, 296
at first reserved for the living, 336
speculatively applied to the dead, 338
for praying for the dead, 339
first grant for the dead, 345
development of, 352, 359, 361
hesitation in accepting, 354
their value, 357
Indults, papal, for bishops, 167
Ineffabilis, bull of Paul II., 210, 217
Inequality of enjoined work, 101
Influence of indulgences, 51, 569
In forma ecclesiæ, 67
Innocent II., indulgence for Cluny, 145
Innocent III. on indulgences by abbots, 13
promises increase of salvation, 41
indulgences for extirpating heretics, 144
for Westminster Abbey, 146
for St. Denis, 147
against Cathari, 152
sells exemptions from crusades, 155
indulgence for Lyons bridge, 177
to avert an omen, 184
for marrying prostitutes, 188
founds the S. Spirito in Saxia, 189
on quæstuarii, 286
absolution after death, 332
approves Order of Trinity, 497
honors the Veronica, 504
Innocent IV. promises remission of sins, 59
indulgence without conditions, 62
his moderate indulgences, 147
his canonizations, 151
his use of redemption funds, 158, 160
price of crusading indulgences, 159
prayer for St. Louis, 184
Carmelite forgeries, 255
inquisitors to silence pardoners, 290
judgment immediate, 317
indulgence for hearing mass, 533
Innocent V. on constitution of treasure, 25
value of indulgences, 46
indulgence for Charles IV., 278
Innocent VI, division of oblations, 206
Innocent VIII., remission *in forma ecclesiæ*, 68
his college of secretaries, 183
approves the rosary, 485
Innocent X. reduces corn-tax in jubilee, 217
Innocent XI., one plenary a day, 94
extends Portiuncula to the dead, 249
confirms the *Via Crucis*, 466
rosary indulgences, 487
indulgences for the Veronica, 505
materials of indulgenced objects, 510
of Holy Land objects, 515
Innocent XII., suspension during jubilee, 221, 227
grant to churches of Assisi, 247
silences dispute as to Carmelites, 262
confirms the *Via Crucis*, 466
medals of Monserrat, 520
indulgence for mental prayer, 529
prayers for English Catholics, 538
instruction for jubilee, 579
Inquisition, indulgences in aid of, 78, 408
opposes the Sabbatine Bull, 274
to restrain pardoners, 290
suppresses opposition to indulgences, 377

Inquisition punishes contempt for cruzada, 431
Inquisitors, indulgence to listen to, 178
Insane, the, indulgences for, 82
Instructions, Tetzel's, for pardoners, 389
Intention of pope, prayers for, 118
Intention, classification of, 119
to confess suffices, 110
of penitent necessary, 119
unnecessary for Portiuncula, 248
of priest in privileged masses, 370
in indulgenced objects, 512
Intercession of martyrs, 5
of the Church, 8
of the saints, 15
Interim, the, 417
Invocation of souls in purgatory, 362
Irenæus on future life, 300
Isabella of England, indulgence for, 191
Isidor, St, of Seville, on purgatory, 306
Italy, indulgences to aid Inquisition, 408
St. Peter's bull revoked, 420
Ivo of Chartres on purgatory, 310
Abraham's Bosom, 316
release from purgatory, 334
Ivory crucifixes, 511

JAEN, the Santo Rostro in, 502
Jaricot, Marie, invents the Living Rosary, 489
Jeanne de Valois, her chaplet, 525
Jerome, St, on monachism in Palestine, 253
on future life 302
Jesuit churches, their indulgences, 464
Jesuits claim exception from suspension, 222
claim exemption from reforms, 461
their confraternity, 490
their fictitious indulgences, 558
restricted in use of indulgences, 573
Jesus, kneeling at the name of, 186
Jews, prayers for the dead, 320
Joan Andrea, indulgences for the dead, 340
Johannes de Fabrica, indulgences for the dead, 348
Johannes Teutonicus, suffrages for the damned, 334
John VIII. on pardon of those slain in battle, 132, 331
John XV. canonizes St. Ulric, 150
John XXII., commissions to bishops, 38
his moderate indulgences, 148, 150
his canonizations, 151
obligation of heirs, 158
fees in his tax-list, 183
prayers indulgenced by, 185
minatory masses indulgenced, 186
John XXII., his letters of indulgence, 191
indulgence to Poissy, 235
Franciscan indulgences, 239
confirms Carmelite Order, 261
his Sabbatine Bull, 270
indulgence for mendicant habit, 278
arrests pardoners, 291
error as to divine Vision, 317
prayers for Philippe le Long, 339
indulgence for Angelus, 443
indulgence for St. Peter's, 448
John XXIII. commissions laymen to grant indulgences, 30
his indulgences, 68
crusade against Ladislas, 153, 375
John of Freiburg, function of granting indulgences, 29
John of Gaunt, crusade to Spain, 154
John of Imola, indulgences for the dead, 342
John of Jerusalem, book ascribed to, 256
John of Salisbury on fraternity, 17
Joseph, St., modern cult of, 493
Seven Sorrows and Joys of, 530
ejaculation of, 531
Josephus on Abraham's Bosom, 315
Jouhanneaud, performance of penance, 129
Juan I. (Aragon) in St. Patrick's Purgatory, 312
Juan I. (Castile) suppresses quæstuarii, 412
Juan de la Cruz, beads of, 566
Jubilee, promises offered in, 41
indulgence, its power over *culpa*, 63, 72
extended throughout Europe, 65
of 1525, unconditioned, 78
children can acquire it, 82
toties quoties indulgence, 93
performance of penance, 127
sale of local, 182
its antiquity, 195, 200
of 1300, 199
of 1350, 202
extended, 205
quarrel over oblations, 206
of 1390, 207
of 1423, 208
of 1450, 209
influence of, 576
of 1475, 210
of 1500, 212
indulgences for the dead, 351
of 1525 and 1550, 214
no indulgences for the dead, 354
of 1575, 215
of 1600, 216
extension of, regulated, 216
no proclamation required, 217
modern, 218
suspension of indulgences, 219

Jubilee indulgence, its advantages, 228
commutation of vows, 229
extraordinary, 231
alms for, 438
charity of the *SS. Trinità*, 482
of Leo XIII., indulgence for, 540
of 1825, Wiseman's description, 575
of 1700, instruction for, 579
Judgment, time of, 315
the particular, 317
Juenin, value of indulgences, 50
indiscreet indulgences, 574
Julius II., his bull *Liquet omnibus*, 74
suspension of indulgences, 220, 226
masses with 9 collects, 328
indulgences for the dead, 351
grants personal privileges, 367
his necessities, 379, 381
recognizes the Alexian Brothers, 474
Julius III., his jubilee of 1550, 214
reassembles C. of Trent, 418
Jurisdiction, key of, in indulgences, 28
requisite for indulgences, 96. 163
perplexities caused by, 171
or suffrage for the dead, 338, 350
Justin Martyr, pseudo, on future life, 299
Justus, case of, 330

KADDISH, prayer for the dead, 320
Katzenberger, efficacy of privileged masses, 369
Key of jurisdiction in indulgences, 28
Keys, the, may err, 46
Kneeling at the name of Jesus, 186
Kostka, Stanislas St. indulgences for, 532

LACTANTIUS on future life, 300
Lacticinios, bula de, 194
Ladislas of Naples, indulgence against, 68
Laillier, Jean, his heresies, 379
Laodicæa, C. of, rejects Maccabees, 319
Lateran basilica included in jubilee, 203
its indulgences confirmed, 280, 453
its abuse of communication, 454
gold medals of, 507
Lateran, C. of, 1122, its indulgence, 58
C. of, 1179, its indulgence, 58
crusade against Cathari, 152
C. of, 1216, restricts episcopal indulgences, 13, 163
methods of eluding, 165, 170
grants indulgences, 60, 169
indulgences for money, 156
forbids new Orders, 255
represses pardoners, 286
on false indulgences, 552
Lateran C. of, 1514, suppresses blasphemy, 283
Spanish memorial to, 384
its bull of reform, 385
Latomus on origin of indulgences, 9
on canonical penance, 33
indulgences for the dead, 353
admits abuses, 401
Latrobe, monk of, 89
Launoy on Carmelite fictions, 262, 265, 275
Lavaur, C. of, 1363, cumulative indulgence, 174
C. of, 1368, indulgences granted, 188
Lavorio on *plena* and *plenissima*, 42
forgotten sins, 54
indulgences *a culpa*, 79
sufficiency of cause, 99
state of grace, 108
suspension during jubilee, 227
exaggerated partials, 282
Stations of Rome, 447
Lawrence O'Toole, St., his canonization, 150
Laymann, suspension during jubilee, 227
Laymen commissioned to grant indulgences, 30
Lazarists, their red scapular, 499
Lazarus, Hospital of, its indulgences, 78
Legacies for masses, 327, 360
Legates, their power to grant indulgences, 168
Legend of Portiuncula, 236
of Carmelite Scapular, 263
Leib, Kilian, on wickedness of Rome, 406
Leipzig disputation, the, 395
Le Maire, Bishop, on greed of priests, 327
Lent fasting mitigated, 193
Lenzuolo at Chambéry, 503
Leo I. on merits of saints, 15
knows nothing of purgatory, 304
invocation of, 324
Leo III., indulgence ascribed to, 134
Leo IV. on the slain in battle with pagans, 331
Leo VIII., indulgence ascribed to, 134
Leo IX. burns forged charters, 137
dedicates church of S. Remi, 142
Leo X., his crusading indulgence, 75
indulgence to Nürnberg hospital, 76
his definition of indulgences, 77
his grants of indulgences, 98
faculties granted to legates, 169
seizes local indulgences, 181
confirms Confraternity of the Holy Ghost, 190
suspension of indulgences, 220
grants for Franciscans, 235, 278
grant to the Minims, 245
favors the Observantines, 250
coronation of Francis I., 277
indulgence to St. Annunciata, 281

Leo X., indulgences for various objects, 283
masses with 9 collects, 328
grants privileged altars, 352
defines indulgences for the dead, 353
their certainty, 358
grants personal privileges, 367
his financial expedients, 381
his proposed crusade, 385
organizes St Peter's indulgence, 386
sends a golden rose to Frederic the Wise, 396
his liberality to his sister, 400
uses the *Scala Santa*, 457
indulgences for *Via Crucis*, 465
indulgence for confraternity, 474
confirms the rosary, 485
the Birgittine chaplet, 524
rosary of the Holy Cross, 526
Leo XI. uses Carmelite scapular, 264
Leo XII, penance in his jubilee, 127
his jubilee, 218
exceptions to suspension, 222
revives the cruzada, 432
increases Stations of Rome, 452
restores the Marian Congregations, 491
chaplet of the Five Wounds, 525
Leo XIII. his *toties quoties* indulgence, 95
his extraordinary jubilees, 233
his liberation of souls, 357
alms for jubilee, 439
indulgences for money, 441
for Tertiaries, 463
facilitates the *Via Crucis*, 468
the Leonine Society, 483
joins the Perpetual Rosary, 490
cult of Holy Family, 494
for Servite churches, 497
validates irregular scapulars, 501
confraternity of Sacro Volto, 506
images of St. Peter, 522
chaplet of Seven Sorrows, 525
devotion to the Virgin, 539
indulgence for his jubilee, 540
his use of indulgences, 543
Leo, Brother, affirms the Portiuncula, 240
Leonardo da Porto Maurizio improves the *Via Crucis*, 467
Leonine Society, 483
Leopold of Tuscany dissolves confraternities, 479
on indulgences, 545
Lepanto, its campaign a crusade, 437
Lépicier, uncertainty of indulgences, 122
prodigality of indulgences, 528
easy escape from purgatory, 549
fictitious indulgences, 564
influence of indulgences, 569
Letters of fraternity, 17
confessional, 70
of indulgence, 191
Libelli of the martyrs, 5
Liber Conformitatum, 244
Diurnus, no indulgences in, 133
Liberation of souls, 347
by masses, 235
depends on suffrage, 355
certificates of, 359, 369
Liége, indulgence against, 58
Liguori, S. Alph., indulgences are absolutions, 30
sufficiency of cause, 100
performance of works, 117
performance of penance, 126
Limbus Patrum and *Puerorum*, 303
is Abraham's Bosom, 315, 316
Limoges, C. of, 1032, indulgence at, 133
struggle for oblations at, 136
Limosina, of Naples crociata, 437
Liquet omnibus bull, 74, 192, 351
Liudulf of Corvey, 286
Living Rosary, the, 489
Loan of indulgenced objects, 512
Lollards reject indulgences, 374
Loreto, litany of, 539
Lorraine, Card. of, at C of, Trent, 419
Lorraine, Duke of, jubilee granted to, 214
Louis II. pilgrimage to Rome, 197
Louis VIII. his crusade against Languedoc, 157
Louis IX. indulgenced prayer for him, 97, 184, 277
redemption funds granted to, 160
Loyola, his blessed candle, 509
Lucca, indulgence from Alex. II., 140
Santo Volto in, 503
Lucian on succor for the dead, 321
Lucianus issues *libelli*, 6
Lucius III. promises remission of sins, 59
indulgence for Venice, 146
forgery of papal letters, 551
Ludger, St., letter ascribed to, 134
Lugo on equality of remissions, 53
Luigi Gonzaga, St. indulgences for, 532
Luisa de Carrion, her crosses, 564
Luther, dread of his objurgation, 214
indulgences for the dead, 352
commences his attack, 390
his account of his career, 392
his ninety-five theses, 393, 394
his progress, 395
his popularity, 396
Lyons, indulgences for cathedral, 148
indulgences for bridge, 177
jubilee of, 208
C. of, 1245, grants indulgences, 158, 169
on episcopal indulgences, 165
on pardoners, 291
C. of, 1274, its indulgence, 60, 62
on Carmelites, 259

MABILLON, early indulgence claimed by, 132
Maccabees, prayers for the dead in, 319
Macro on confraternities, 479
Magdeburg, rising in favor of Luther, 398
Magic, jubilee regarded as, 51
Maguelonne, forged indulgences of, 138
indulgence from Urban II , 140
Mainz, price of pallium, 388
C. of, 1261, 1301, on pardoners, 287
C. of, 1310, indulgence for the dead, 338
Malta, Knights of, sell indulgences, 439
Manfred of Naples, crusade against, 62, 153, 581
Manigart on fictitious indulgences, 560
Mansionarie, 362
Manuel de Limoges on episcopal confirmation, 445
Manus porrigentibus adjutrices, 102
forbidden by Pius V., 424
Marburg, indulgence for, 148
Mare Magnum of the Carmelites, 255
Marrying prostitutes, indulgence for, 188
Martin IV. crusade against Pedro III., 154
Martin V., his reforms, 70, 385
forbids cumulation by Cardinals, 174
indulgences for Corpus Christi, 187
his jubilee of 1423, 208
does not restrain pardoners, 292
instructions to inquisitors, 376
Martyrs, their intercession, 5
1480, feast of, 132
Mass, indulgence for hearing, 187, 282, 533
traffic in, 328
for those who aid the Church, 483
used for the dead, 323, 326
of St. Gregory, 561
papal, indulgence at, 107
Masses, privileged, 367
price of, 364
efficacy of, 368
doubts as to, 370
Massillon limits indulgences, 574
Materialization of relations with God, 580
Materials of indulgenced objects, 510
Matthew of Krokow, sale of indulgences, 294
Maurice de Sully, his indulgences, 164
Maximilian I. erects a *Via Crucis*, 465
Mazdeism, resurrection in, 297
succor for the dead, 319
mourning for the dead forbidden, 324
Measure of Virgin's foot, 566
Meat in fasts, 192
Mechlin, C. of, 1570, false indulgences, 559
C. of, 1607, on Tridentine reform, 425
Medicinal penance not relieved by indulgence, 126
Medal, indulgenced, 517
when defaced, 511
of the Five Saints, 368, 519
the miraculous, 493
of the Veronica, 504
of Monserrat, 519
of Moutouset, 521
of St. Benedict, 520
of Immaculate Conception, 521
Medina, Miguel, on the treasure, 22
it replaces deficient penance, 33
on episcopal power, 38
thirty indulgences a day, 94
proportionate works, 104
exaggerated partials, 281
indulgences for the dead, 354
emptying purgatory, 356
jurisdiction over purgatory, 357
indulgence in *forum internum*, 403
on stationarii, 423
indulgence for Angelus, 444
usefulness of indulgences, 574
Mendicant habit, indulgence for kissing, 278
Orders, their forgeries, 553
Mercantile character of indulgences, 390
Merced, Order of, indulgences condemned, 557
Mercy, indulgences for works of, 188, 534
Merits, treasury of, 14
transfer of, 17
indulgences based on, 18
of Christ and the Saints, 25
Mexico, false indulgences in, 563
Meyer, Martin, sale of indulgences, 295
Michael of Angers, his indulgence, 31
Mignanti, his indulgences of St. Peter's, 456
Milice du Pape, la, 537
Milk-food in fasts, 192
Millenarians, 302
Miltitz as papal nuncio, 396
Minden, indulgence claimed for, 139
Minims, grant to, by Leo X., 245
Misfortune averted by indulgences, 51
by Carmelite scapular, 269
Mirabilia Romæ, 280
Missæ adventitiæ, 326
Moderation of early indulgences, 145
enjoined by C. of Trent, 421
disregard of injunction, 442
Mohr, evil of indulgences, 574
Möhring, Dietrich, his punishment, 351
Molinos, Miguel, his views on indulgences, 544
Money, indulgences issued for, 97
crusading vows commuted for, 155
more wanted than crusaders, 157, 161
chief object of indulgences, 179

Monica St., mass for her soul, 324, 326
Monks grant fraternities, 17
indulgences injurious to, 234
Monserrat, privileged crosses and beads of, 368, 519
indulgences of, sold in France, 425
fraudulent indulgences, 557
Monte Cassino, indulgence claimed for, 139
consecration of its church, 142
medal of, 521
Monte Vergine, catastrophe of, 577
Montigiani, antiquity of jubilee, 195
Montmajour, indulgence of, 137
Montpellier, hospital of S. Spiritus, 189
Montreuil-les-Dames, Veronica at, 504
Mont-S.-Michel, its indulgences, 148
Morality, influence of indulgences on, 51, 569
Moreau de S. Méry on the cruzada, 429
Morin on letter of St. Ludger, 134
Morone dreads independence of Germany, 406
opposes legislation on indulgences, 419
Mortuary masses, 326, 339
Moscoso, Card., on Spanish revenue, 430
Mourning for the dead, 324
Multiplication of indulgences for the dead, 359, 361
in modern times, 528
Muratori on origin of indulgences, 9
evil of indulgences, 575
Muzzarelli, his theory of indulgences, 7
de injunctis pœnitentiis, 33
his work on indulgences, 546
Mystics, their disregard of indulgences, 543

NAPLES, crociata indulgence, 85, 436
Narbonne, C. of, 1054, its indulgences, 55
treatment of papal indulgence, 179
Natale, Padre, indulgences of Roman churches, 453
Need of indulgence a requisite, 120
Neuburg, forged indulgence of, 138
New Granada, cruzada revived in, 433
New Learning, its antagonism to indulgences, 380
Nicholas I., his penance for Eriath, 132
pilgrimage to Rome, 197
no allusion to purgatory, 309
Nicholas II., indulgence ascribed to, 139
dedicates S. Lorenzo, 142
Nicholas III., indulgence for St. Peter's, 198
Nicholas IV., indulgences for English churches, 149
his crusade of 1291, 159
prayer for Charles II. of Naples, 185
Nicholas IV. confirms the S. Spirito in Saxia, 189
indulgence for St. Peter's, 198
Nicholas V., promises in his jubilee, 42
indulgence for Cyprus, 180
terms for his jubilee, 182
his jubilee of 1450, 209
suppresses opposition to indulgences, 377
on fraudulent indulgences, 552
Nicholas of Clairvaux accepts purgatory, 311
Nicholas of Cusa on remission of sins, 60
indulgences *a culpa*, 72
as jubilee commissioner, 182
indulgence for the dead, 344
Nicholas Richard, indulgences for the dead, 348
Nicholas, St., translation of his relics, 142
presides over purgatory, 313
Nicodemus, his crucifix, 503
Nivelon of Soissons helps bridge at Châlons, 177
Nobla Leyczon, the, 372
Nogueira, emptying purgatory, 356
Norham Castle, indulgence for repairing, 283
Nôtre Dame, church of, 164
absence of indulgences, 143
Notti, Stefano, no early evidence of indulgences, 4
his *Opus Remissionis*, 12
value of indulgences, 49
indulgences *a culpa*, 73
expectation of pardon, 83
computation of partials, 86
consent of confessor, 106
episcopal cumulation, 172, 176
payment for indulgences, 181
fictitious indulgences, 567
Novena of Our Lady of M. Carmel, 268
Novendialia, 321, 323, 325
Nürnberg, grievances of, 1523, 295, 401
Nursia, indulgence for hospital, 190

OBJECTS of indulgences, 177
Objects, indulgenced, 507
traffic in, 510, 513
their transfer prohibited, 512
worn or mutilated, 512
touched to holy things, 514
from the Holy Land, 515
by blessing, 517
cumulation of, 527
Oblate Missionaries, their privileged masses, 370
Oblations, struggle for, 136
of jubilee, quarrel over, 206
for the dead, 327

Observantines, quarrels with Conventuals, 250
their *Via Crucis*, 466
their Holy Land objects, 515
Œuvre de la sainte Enfance, 441
Œuvre pie des Soldats, 537
Odo of Cluny, pilgrimage to Rome, 197
no allusion to purgatory, 309
Odo of Toul promises remission of sins, 59
O Madre de Dio, indulgence for, 532
Omar persecutes Carmelites, 254, 258
Onofri, expectation of pardon, 85
state of grace, 109
disposition of penitent, 115
performance of penance, 127
mitigation of fasting, 194
list of Stations of Rome, 451
fees for Holy Land indulgences, 459
crowds seeking indulgences, 577
Onus Ecclesiæ, the, 401
Opere operato of indulgences, 82
in indulgences for the dead, 361
Opposition to indulgences for the dead, 346
to lavish indulgences. 293, 543
Optatus, St., on future judgment, 300
Oraculo vivæ vocis, grants by, 461
Orders, indulgence not a function of, 28
Orders, religious, influence on indulgences, 234
their indulgences communicated, 278
their privileged altars, 365
their indulgences, 460
indulgences for their churches, 463
their forgeries, 553
limitation of indulgences, 573
Origen on future life, 301
Origin of indulgences, 3, 5, 131
Orter, Georg, opposes *Butterbriefe*, 193
Orthodoxy tested by indulgences, 544
Osa de la Vega, Veronica in, 502
Otho III. absolved after death, 332
Oudewater, Jan van, on Carmelite scapular, 263

PADERBORN, indulgence for, 147
Padua, Bishop of, almsgiving in jubilee, 232
Pagan conceptions of purgatory, 301
Pagi on fictitious indulgences, 133, 134
Pain of loss, 316
Painted images not indulgenced, 510
Palæonydorus on Carmelite scapular, 263
Palestine, monachism of, 253
Pallavicino, uncertainty of indulgences, 121
explains the Reformation, 400
defence of indulgences, 572
Palmieri, Professor, adopts Amort's theory, 8
the treasure, 22, 26
indulgences are of the internal forum, 29
they supply defects of penance, 34
papal control, 38
value of indulgences, 51
years and quarantines, 87
sufficiency of cause, 101
proportionate works, 105
state of grace, 110, 363
performance of penance, 129
emptying purgatory, 356
indulgences for benefactors, 442
asserts stations of Gregory I., 447
Palmieri, Vicenzo, his work on indulgences, 81, 546
discretion implied, 575
Pannilini, Bishop, on popular error, 82
on indulgences, 547
Panormitanus, value of indulgences, 48
consent of confessor, 105
Panvinio on Roman Stations, 449
on the *Scala Santa*, 457
Papal benediction, its indulgence, 541
letters, forgery of, 551
power over *culpa*, 76
Papenbroek on fictitious indulgences, 133, 134
on Carmelite forgeries, 258, 262
Pardon, expectation of, 83
of sin, gained by slaughter, 153
Pardoners, see *Quæstuarii*.
Pardons, indulgences rank as, 65
Parents, sins of, 164
Paris, C. of, 1147, condemns Gilbert de la Porrée, 333
C. of, 1557, on confraternities, 476
Paris churches, their privileged altars, 366
Parlement of Paris on Xaintes indulgence, 220
regulates indulgences, 387
expels quæstuarii, 425
Partial indulgences, 11
their computation, 85
their cumulation, 91
suspended during jubilees, 220
for thousands of years, 279
Partial and plenary combined, 91
Paschal II., fighting infidels as penance, 10
absolution based on merits, 18
indulgence for Robert of Flanders, 57
indulgence to prelates, 197
forged bull for *Scala Santa*, 458
Paschasius V., pseudo, 344
Pasqualigo, expectation of pardon, 85
state of grace, 109
performance of penance, 126
suspension during jubilee, 227

Passion, representation of the, 465
Paters and Aves, five suffice, 119
indulgences for, 188
Patrick, St , his indulgence, 133
Patrick's, St , Purgatory, 311
Paul, St., his pardon of sinner, 5
Paul II., jubilee indulgence *a culpa*, 72
fees for letters of indulgence, 191
proclaims jubilee for 1475, 210
prayers for Ferdinand of Portugal, 339
Paul III., indulgences for Jesuits, 223
projects of reform, 293, 410
restricts indulgences, 409
renews the cruzada, 412
suggests indulgenced objects, 508
Paul IV , his declaration of faith, 5
on the Portiuncula, 244
authorizes employment of quæstuarii, 422
indulgenced objects, 508
indulgence to Dominican churches, 555
Paul V., his jubilee of 1606, 233
limits the Sabbatine Bull, 274
grants indulgences for alms, 439
indulgence for Sorbonne, 445
limits communication of indulgences, 454
visit to the sacrament, 456
reforms indulgences of Regulars, 460
rosary indulgences, 487
Confraternity of Seven Sorrows of Mary, 496
Holy Land Objects, 515
Dottrina Cristiana, 536
sends his benediction, 541
Paul of Passau on theories of indulgences, 20
Pauliano on antiquity of indulgences, 4
indulgences grant salvation, 78
sufficiency of cause, 98
disposition of penitent, 113
performance of works, 117
money the sole object, 181
Paupers, indulgence for feeding, 534
Pavia, Augustinian church of, its indulgence, 149
Paving, indulgences for, 178
Payment proportionate to wealth, 102, 435, 439
estimate of, for indulgences, 179
Pedro de Osma rejects indulgences, 351, 378
Pedro de Zaragoza, his indulgence, 36
Peine du dam, 316
Penance mitigated by pilgrimages, 9
indulgence substituted for, 10
priestly discretion as to, 11, 14
replaced by payment from the treasure, 27
deficient supplied by indulgence, 31
salutary, is pecuniary, 75
Penance or purgatory, days of, 88
performance of, in indulgences, 122
medicinal, not relieved by indulgence, 126
Penitent, his disposition, 112
his intention requisite, 119
relapsing, indulgences useful for, 35, 570
Perauld, Raymond, privileged altars, 344, 345
punishes Dr. Möhring, 351
Perez, Diego, on frauds of quæstuarii, 413
Performance of works, 116
of penance, 122
Personal indulgences, 191
privileged altars, 366
Perpetua, St., Passion of, 322
Perpetual Rosary, the, 490
Peter of Alexandria on martyrs, 6
Peter Cantor on arguments for indulgences, 20
value of indulgences, 44
forgotten sins, 54
Peter Damiani on purgatory, 309
Peter the Hermit, use of beads, 523
Peter Lombard on purgatory, 311
succor for the dead, 335
Peter Martyr, St , his canonization, 151
Peter of Palermo on indulgences *a culpa*, 62
indulgences for the dead, 342
on state of grace, 360
Peter of Poitiers, proportionate payment, 102
Peter of Swanington, his life of S. Simon Stock, 264
Peter, St , images of, 522
Peter and Paul, indulgences based on their merits, 19
Peter the Venerable refuses funeral rites, 330
Petrobrusians, the, 372
Pharisees pray for the dead, 319
Philip (Emp.) his secular games, 195
Philip II , his cumulative episcopal indulgence, 176, 426
prohibits frauds of cruzada, 413
resists reform at Trent, 420
disregards Tridentine reforms, 425
obtains the cruzada from Pius V., 427
his revenues, 430
Philip V. endeavors to reform the cruzada, 432
Philippe le Long regulates a confraternity, 474
Philippe de Valois, his crusade, 158
forbids pilgrimage, 203
Philippe of Artois, indulgenced prayers for, 185
Piazza, indulgence of Scala Santa, 458

Picchinesi, Bishop, restores indulgences, 548
Pictores Veronicarum, 505
Pictures used in *Via Crucis*, 469
Pierre de Braine, redemptions given to, 160
Pierre de Milhaud, Carmelite general, 260
Pierre de la Palu on the treasure, 25
utilizing indulgences, 35
episcopal powers, 37
plena and *plenissima*, 42
value of indulgences, 47
toties quoties indulgences, 93
sufficiency of cause, 96
episcopal cumulation, 173
the Carmelites, 260
prayers for the damned, 334
indulgences for the dead, 338
Piers Plowman's Creed on *culpa*, 64
Pietro Bernardino, his heresy, 379
Pietro da Catania, his miracles suppressed, 238
Pietro of Orvieto on remission of sins, 60
Pignatelli on *plena* and *plenissima*, 43
efficiency of indulgences, 50
angels cannot gain indulgences, 82
disposition of penitent, 113
number of plenaries, 220
commutation of vows, 230
Pilgrimage, its influence on penance, 9
to Holy Land, plenary for, 187
Pilgrims empowered to grant indulgences, 188
result of crowds of, 577
Pilichdorff, Ps., on frauds of quæstuarii, 65
Pirckheimer, Wilibald, on Tetzel, 393
Pisa, C. of, 1309, its indulgence, 67
Pistoja, indulgence for, 145
C of, 1786, denies the treasure, 25
penance covered by indulgence, 33
on *Limbus Puerorum*, 304
indulgences for the dead, 355
theory of indulgences, 546
Pius II., remission *in forma ecclesiæ*, 68
indulgence *a culpa*, 72
defends sale of indulgences, 295
grants the Stations of Rome, 449
Pius III., indulgences at his conclave, 74
enlargement of Portiuncula, 246
Pius IV., indulgence for Hospital of St. Lazarus, 78, 281, 442
reduces charges for indulgences, 419
revokes the St. Peter's bull, 420
indulgence to confraternity, 481
Pius V. reduces indulgence of St. Lazarus, 78, 281
forbids use of quæstuarii, 424
rebukes the cruzada, 426
renews the cruzada, 427
organizes a crusade, 438
attributes rosary to St. Dominic, 486
Pius V. establishes feast of rosary, 488
indulgence for aid to shipwrecked, 535
for *Dottrina Cristiana*, 536
abuse of indulgences, 571
Pius VI. makes the treasure *de fide*, 25
on penance covered by indulgences, 34
grants crociata to Naples, 436
reforms Stations of Rome, 452
regulates indulgences of St. Praxeda, 455
on a devotion to the Trinity, 480
defends the Blessed Heart of Jesus, 492
indulgence for *Angele Dei*, 529
for new prayers, 531
for visiting hospitals, 535
against Tuscan heresies, 547
Pius VII. imposes conditions on indulgence, 80
grants indulgences for money, 440
renews Portuguese cruzada, 436
confirms indulgences of Scala Santa, 458
simplifies the *Via Crucis*, 468
alternate prayers, 489
confirms confraternity of Blood of Christ, 499
his indulgenced crucifixes, 521
chaplet of the Precious Blood, 525
indulgence for *Angele Dei*, 529
for Mysteries of the Infancy, 530
for new prayers, 531
for Asiatic Catholics, 533
for feeding paupers, 534
for *Casa di Refugio*, 535
family indulgences, 542
Pius VIII. simplifies the *Via Crucis*, 468
Pius IX. indulgence at canonizations, 80
for children, 81
his jubilee is *toties quoties*, 93
Theatine churches, 100
commutes the sacrament, 112
penance in his jubilee, 127
his jubilees, 218
his extraordinary jubilees, 232, 233
Portiuncula is *toties quoties*, 249
confirms privileged masses, 370
renews the cruzada, 432
indulgences for money, 440
visit to the sacrament, 456
visit to the Seven Churches, 456
extends indulgence of *Scala Santa*, 458
indulgences for Tertiaries, 462
the *Via Crucis*, 467, 468
stimulates confraternities, 481
confraternity of St. Michael, 483
sodalities of the rosary, 487
indulgence for the rosary, 489
the Living Rosary, 489
the Perpetual Rosary, 490
cult of St. Joseph, 493, 494
the blue scapular, 498

Pius IX , the red scapular, 499
scapular of Heart of Jesus, 500
allows copies of the Veronica, 505
chain of St. Peter, 516
images of St. Peter, 522
chaplet of Seven Sorrows, 525
of the Five Wounds, 525
of the Sacred Heart of Mary, 526
of St Michael, 526
rosary of the Holy Cross, 526
indulgence for ejaculations, 530
use of Holy Water, 530
Seven Sorrows and Joys of St. Joseph, 530
indulgence for *En Ego*, 530
for visiting hospitals, 535
for *Œuvre pie des Soldats*, 537
to suppress revolt, 538
for Immaculate Conception, 539
for conversion of England, 539
empowers priests to grant benediction, 541
his lavish indulgences, 542
for Vatican Council, 549
orders bishops to examine indulgences, 563
Platæa, feeding the dead of, 321
Platina, his excuse for Boniface IX , 67
Plenary indulgence at Clermont, 11
and partial combined, 91
Plenaries supply deficient penance, 31
varieties of, 40
suspended during jubilees, 220
Plenissima indulgence, 41
Pœna, indulgence releases from, 32, 39
Pœna damni, 316
Pœnitentia injungenda, 31
Pœnitentiis injunctis, de, formula of, 34
Poissy, indulgence for nuns of, 235
Polacchi on gaining more efficiently, 43
sufficiency of cause, 99
works not required, 104
state of grace, 109
performance of penance, 126
power of general councils, 170
suspension during jubilee, 219, 227
exaggerated partials, 282
emptying purgatory, 356
Poland, spread of Reformation, 406
Political objects, indulgences for, 538
Politics, influence of indulgences in, 581
Polling, abbey of, its indulgence, 172, 551
Pomilli, Beringer, his trial, 291
Pomerania, Waldenses of, 372
Pons de Marignan, indulgence ascribed to, 137
Pontas, performance of penance, 127
Poor, the, is the church, 231
Popes, their control over the treasure, 23
acquire control of indulgences, 37
offer indulgences without conditions, 62
Popes, their power over *culpa*, 63, 67, 77
universal jurisdiction, 96
indulgence at their benediction, 104, 541
at their mass, 107
use of crusading indulgences, 152
relations with pardoners, 290
power to empty purgatory, 355
their need of money, 379
their share in the cruzada, 387, 433
in Naples crociata, 436
condemn fictitious indulgences, 559
influence of the treasure on their power, 582
Porta santa, the, 212
Portable altars, privileged masses on, 370
Portiuncula is *a culpa et pœna*, 81
is *toties quoties*, 94
claims exemption from suspension, 223
its legend, 236
extended to Franciscan churches, 245
assumed to be daily, 246
its advantages, 247
is absolution not suffrage, 249
quarrels over, 251
claims application to the dead, 341
Portugal, the cruzada in, 436
the *Via Crucis* in, 467
Pou, Gaspar, indulgences for the dead, 351, 356
Poverty, disadvantage of, 349
Power, concurrent, of bishops, 36
Prague, University of, on Wickliffe, 375
Prayer for Louis IX , indulgence for, 97, 184, 277
Prayers for intention, 118
indulgenced, 184, 529, 531
for the dead, 319
in early Church, 322
indulgences for, 339
Preachers to princes grant indulgences, 185
Preaching, indulgence to listen to, 178
Precedence among confraternities, 480
Premonstratensians, fictitious indulgence of, 557
Price for remitting penance, 12
of crusading indulgences, 155, 159, 161
of grants of indulgences, 182, 183
of letters of indulgence, 191
of St. Peter's indulgence, 390
fixed, for indulgences, discussed, 419
Philip II. refuses to abandon it, 420
of the cruzada, 427, 435
of Naples crociata, 437
Prierias, indulgences not sacramental, 29
value of indulgences, 49
forgotten sins, 54
indulgences *a culpa*, 76
days of penance or purgatory, 88
sufficiency of cause, 98

Prierias, consent of confessor, 106
episcopal indulgences, 166, 176
money the sole object, 181
emptying purgatory, 356
on power of indulgence, 393
Priests grant indulgences, 11
lose power to grant indulgences, 28
share profits of pardoners, 292
personal privilege of, 366
intention in privileged masses, 370
govern confraternities, 481
of the Holy Face, 506
faculties for blessing objects, 517
grant papal benediction, 541
their frauds in indulgences, 553
Primaprimaria, the, 491
Princes, their preachers grant indulgences, 185
Printed images not indulgenced, 510
Printing, its influence on the Reformation, 391
Privateering, indulgence for, 283
Privilege, personal, grants of, 367
Procession at the Portiuncula, 250
Profits from services for the dead, 327
of the cruzada, 412, 429, 431, 434
Profusion of modern indulgences, 528
Promises made in indulgences, 40
of remission of *culpa*, 61
Proportion of work for indulgences, 101
Prostitutes, indulgence for marrying, 188
Protestant books, demand for, 391
Protestantism, its promise of salvation, 578
Prudentius, St., on intercession of saints, 15
Pullus, Card., accepts purgatory, 313
no absolution after death, 332
Purgatory, value of indulgences dependent on, 3
unknown to the Fathers, 4
or penance, days of, 88
duration and nature of torment, 89
efficacy of Portiuncula, 248
of the scapular, 275
texts cited in support, 296
development of belief, 305
not alluded to in Greek Schism, 309
accepted in twelfth century, 310
completes the sacramental theory, 313, 336
remission of, 328
power of Church restricted to, 332
release of souls from, 334
four modes of relief, 335, 338
first indulgence for, 345
few souls attain it, 359
invocation of souls in, 362
accepted by Wickliffe, 374
papal power to empty, 355
Purgatory of St. Patrick, 311
Pusateri on confraternities, 480

QUADRAGENÆ, 86
Quæstuarii, 285
promise remission of *culpa*, 61, 65, 68, 77, 78, 79
serve as messengers, 117
their evil reputation, 286
attempts to punish them, 289
denounced by C. of Vienne, 291
instructions for, 348
their preaching forbidden at Trent, 410
employment forbidden at Trent, 418
their continued employment, 422
forbidden by Pius V., 424
their fabricated letters, 553
Quarantines, how computed, 86
Quarrel over oblations of jubilee, 206
of Observantines and Conventuals, 250
over mortuary masses, 327
Quarti, efficiency of indulgences, 50
Quedo, Jean, case of, 431
Quietism, its relation to indulgences, 544

RABANUS MAURUS, on future life, 308
Raccolta, the, definition of the treasure, 27
efficiency of indulgences, 52
days of penance not purgatory, 90
state of grace, 109
disposition of penitent, 115
performance of works, 117
all indulgences applicable to the dead, 354
their certainty, 358
saints in the, 532
works of mercy in, 534
a test for general indulgences, 563
Raimbaud of Arles, his indulgence, 138
Ramon de Peñafort, theories of indulgences, 21
value of indulgences, 44
indulgences confer grace, 60
cumulation of partials, 91
episcopal indulgences, 165
indulgences for bridges, 177
suffrages for the damned, 334
indulgences for the dead, 336
Ranst, van, definition of indulgences, 39
sufficiency of cause, 100
proportionate works, 104
character of prayers, 118
works to gain jubilee, 231
cataracts of indulgences, 233
alms for jubilee, 439
indulgence of *Scala Santa*, 458
Raoul of Térouane, his *toties quoties* indulgence, 171
Ratherius on good works of the Church, 18

Ratherius, his disinterestedness, 135
on purgatory, 309
Ratisbon, project of reform at, 408
Ravenna, C. of, 1317, reduces indulgence, 166
Raynaud, Theo., on fraternity, 18
defends the Carmelites, 265
Reconciliation as an indulgence, 7
Redemption, its relation to indulgences, 9
of crusading vows, 154, 159
Redemptorists, their confraternity, 492
Reformation, the, 372
effect on jubilee of 1525, 214
assisted by printing, 391
explanations of the, 398
its causes, 405
proposed union of Germany, 406
benefits of, 584
Regis æterni, bull, forged, 208
Regular priests, their intention, 370
Reimputation of sin, 54
Reims, absence of early indulgences, 143
indulgences for cathedral, 165
Relations with God materialized, 580
Religion, indulgences for teaching, 536
Remi, St., translation of his relics, 142
Remission of penance by priests, 12
of sin, 56, 58
proportioned to payment, 179
Renaissance, opposition to indulgences, 377
Renaud, Val., on utilizing indulgence, 35
performance of penance, 127
Repentance, necessity of, 110
Requisites for indulgences, 96
popular ignorance of, 578
Reserved cases absolved in jubilee, 228
Resignation benefits the dead, 324
Resurrection, doctrine of, 297, 318
opposition to, 301
the first, 302
Ricci, Card., suspension during jubilee, 225
in Cong., of Indulgences, 560
Ricci, Scipione, denies the treasure, 25
on devotion to the Trinity, 480
suppresses indulgences, 546
Ricci, Timoteo, founds the Perpetual Rosary, 490
Rich, the, favored by indulgences, 349
Richard I., his death-bed confession, 90
Richard of Cornwall, his crusade, 158
Richard of S. Victor insists on penance, 19
succor for the dead, 335
Rienzo, Cola di, excommunicated, 204
Rigorists on sufficiency of cause, 100
Roads, indulgences to make, 178
Robert of Flammesburg, value of indulgences, 44
indulgences for bridges, 177
Robert of Flanders, indulgence for, 57
Rodolph of Suabia, indulgence for, 57
Rodriguez, indulgence covers penance due, 33
on jubilee indulgence, 42
expectation of pardon, 84
sufficiency of cause, 98
proportionate payment, 103
state of grace, 107, 361
intention of penitent, 119
performance of penance, 127
episcopal indulgences, 166
bula de lacticinios, 194
justifies lavishness, 443
describes Stations of Rome, 450
Roger of Sicily, indulgence for, 56
crusade against, 146
Román de Higuera on Cross of Caravaca, 565
Roman churches, no indulgences in 11th century, 197
indulgences in 1200, 198
their fictitious indulgences, 280
claim privileged altars, 340, 344
growth of indulgences, 448
their enormous indulgences, 453
their indulgences revised, 456
Roman clergy support Cyprian, 570
Roman courts, their venality, 381
Roman funeral rites, 321
Roman Republic, suppression of, 538
Romans, their zeal for indulgences, 450
Rome as a resort for pilgrims, 195
its rapacity and immorality, 384
the Seven Churches, 453
confraternities suppressed, 480
Stations of, see *Stations*.
C. of, 494, accepts Maccabees, 319
C. of, 1116, indulgence for, 197
C. of, 1413, condemns Wickliffe, 375
Rosary, privileged mass of, 367
devotion of, introduced, 484
is falling out of use, 489
substitute for, 510
materials allowed, 510
when broken, 511
formula of blessing, 517
its indulgences, 523
of the Holy Cross, 526
Roth, Bishop, on St. Patrick's Purgatory, 312
Rouen, C. of, 1581, performance of penance, 125
on episcopal supervision, 445
expired indulgences, 567
Rubi, Ant., case of, 431
Ruchrath v. Wesel, his heresies, 378
Rudimentary indulgences, 55
Rufinus on future life, 302
Rule, Carmelite, its origin, 254

SA, MANUEL, days of penance or purgatory, 90
sufficiency of cause, 99
Sabbatine Bull, origin of, 270
limited by Clement VII., 273
by Inquisition, 274
Sacrament, indulgence for accompanying, 187
exposition of, 456
Sacraments conferring plenaries, 541
Sacramental theory completed by purgatory, 313
influences purgatory, 336
Sacramentalia, 512
Sacramentaries, purgatory not alluded to, 307
mortuary masses in, 326
release from hell in, 330
Sacratissimo uti culmine, bull, 271
Sacro Volto, see *Veronica*.
S. Alban's, its indulgences, 148
S. Benigne, Abbey of, its indulgence, 137
S. Denis, indulgence for Abbey of, 147
S. Domingo, cruzada in, 429
S. Gall, fraternities of Abbey of, 17
S. Germain des Prés, indulgence for, 145
S. Giovanni di Porta Latina, privileged altar, 343
S. Joseph's Guild, 495
S. Lazarus, its enormous indulgences, 78, 281, 442
S. Lorenzo, its privileged altar, 345
S. Louis, church of, its indulgence, 149
S. Maria degli Angioli, church of, 236, 247
S. Maria di Castillo, indulgence condemned, 561
S. Maria Maggiore included in jubilee, 207
S. Paul's (London), indulgence for, 150
S. Peter's, its bull of indulgence, 74
suspends all others, 226
indulgences for the dead, 351
its *toties quoties* indulgence, 92
its indulgences in 13th Cent., 198
quarrel over oblations, 206
its indulgences, 279
Paul III.'s bull for, 409
share of the cruzada, 427
indulgences still sold in, 441
indulgence of John XXII., 448
modern indulgences, 456
S. Praxeda, its privileged altar, 344
its indulgences regulated, 455
S. Raphael Society, 483
S. Salvador, convent of, its indulgence, 71
S. Salvator, Order of, founded by St. Birgitta, 243
S. Sebastian, its indulgence, 102
its privileged altar, 345
S. Spirito in Saxia, its indulgence, 76, 189
its pardoners, 289
indulgence for the dead, 344
S. Victor of Marseilles, its forged indulgence, 139
Saints, communion of, 15
their merits in the treasure, 26
suffrages of, 15
for the dead, 325, 326
canonizations of, 150
indulgences at, 80
indulgenced objects, 518
new, indulgences for, 532
in the Raccolta, 532
Salazar, profits of cruzada, 431
Salces, his account of the cruzada, 434
Sale of grants of indulgences, 182
of indulgences permitted at Trent, 419
of modern indulgences, 438
of indulgenced objects, 513
Salmanticenses, definition of indulgence, 39
disposition of penitent, 113
Salvation, increase of, promised, 41
through indulgences, 79
Protestant and Catholic conditions of, 578
Salvianus St., on merits of saints, 15
on future destiny, 304
denies succor for the dead, 325
Salutary penance is pecuniary, 75
Salzburg, C. of, 1274, on pardoners, 287
suspends indulgences, 570
C of, 1456, on pardoners, 288
Sancha of Naples, her gift to the Portiuncula, 241
Sanchez, Mig., expectation of pardon, 85
performance of penance, 129
Sanchez, Tomás, sufficiency of cause, 99
performance of works, 117
Sancta Sanctorum, the chapel, 457
Sangerhausen, heretics burned, 373
Santo Rostro, the, see *Veronica*.
Saracinesca, frauds at, 552
Saragossa, indulgence granted at, 36, 284
Sarpi on Paul V.'s jubilee, 233
indulgences relax discipline, 572
Satisfaction, vicarious, use of treasure for, 23
completed by indulgence, 31
Saturday liberation of souls, 275
Savoy, spread of Reformation, 406
Saxons, pilgrimage to Rome, 196
Sbaralea, on Portiuncula, 239
Scala Cœli, privileged altar, 340
Scala Santa, the, 457
forged bull of Paschal II., 458
Scapular, Blue, unconditioned indulgence of, 80
Carmelite, see *Carmelite*.
of the *Cincturati*, 496

Scapular of Seven Sorrows of Mary, 496
of Order of Trinity, 497
of Immaculate Conception, 498
of the Passion, 498
of Heart of Jesus, 499
of S. Camillo de Lellis, 499
of the Passionists, 499
of Blood of Jesus Christ, 499
Scapulars, multiple, 501
their form, 264
Scholæ Piæ, indulgences for, 536
Scotus, Duns, on constitution of treasure, 25
Sebastian of Portugal on indulgences, 422
Sendomir, indulgence to church of, 87
Sens, C. of, 1528, on confraternities, 476
Sergius II., indulgence ascribed to, 134
Serrada, intention of penitent, 120
on confraternities, 479
uncertainty of indulgences, 568
Servite churches, their indulgences, 464, 497
Servites, their chaplet, 525
fictitious indulgences, 557
Seven churches, the, of Rome, 453
plenary for visiting, 456
Seven Sorrows and Joys of St. Joseph, 530
Shepherd of Hermas on purgatory, 301
Shipwrecked, indulgence for helping, 535
Sibylline Books on future life, 300
Sicily, the cruzada in, 436
confraternities in, 480
Siena, C. of, 1423, grants indulgences, 169
Carmelite forgery, 257
Sigebert of Gemblours, his protest, 58
Sigismund (Emp.), prayer for him indulgenced, 186
Simon de Montfort, crusade against him, 153
Simony in indulgences for money, 97
none in sale of indulgences, 156
Sins, payment for, from the treasure, 27
forgotten, 32, 53
equally remitted, 53
reimputation of, 54
remission of, 56, 58
in expectation of indulgence, 83, 571
Sirat, Bridge, 307
Sisters of Charity, indulgences for, 537
Sixtus IV., confessional letter, 70
jubilee indulgence *a culpa*, 72
indulgence for S. Spirito in Saxia, 190
his jubilee of 1475, 210
suspends indulgences, 211, 220, 224
indulgence for Franciscans, 236, 450
for Carmelites, 255, 257
first indulgence for the dead, 345
absolution in *forum externum*, 402
approves the rosary, 484
ceremony of the Veronica, 504
Sixtus V. requires proportionate payment, 103
his extraordinary jubilee, 232
privileged altars, 364
removes the *Scala Santa*, 457
founds the *Cordigeri*, 477
indulgences for the rosary, 486
invents indulgenced objects, 507
indulgence for ejaculation, 530
Società de' Suffragi, 354
Societas Calobibliophilorum, 536
Société de S. François Régis, 535
Solemnities of the Portiuncula, 250
Solomon of Constance, indulgence claimed for, 132
Sorbonne on liberation of souls, 347
emptying purgatory, 355
condemns Laillier and Vitrier, 379
episcopal confirmation necessary, 445
Soresino, indulgence of Scala Santa, 458
Soto, Domingo, indulgences date from apostles, 4
indulgence is an absolution, 30
indulgence covers penance due, 33
days of penance or purgatory, 89
sufficiency of cause, 98
proportionate payment, 103
proportionate works, 104
state of grace, 107, 360
performance of penance, 125
power of general councils, 170
benefit of masses, 328
Trajan's release from hell, 330
funeral rites indifferent, 330
prayers for the damned, 334
on privileged objects, 367
indulgence for Aves, 444
Soto, Pedro de, no early evidence of indulgences, 4
on deficient penance, 33
Souls in purgatory, their invocation, 362
Spain, *bula de lacticinios*, 194
opposition to Sabbatine Bull, 274
contest over St. Peter's indulgence, 386
the cruzada, 412
the modern cruzada, 426
its revenue, 430
excesses of confraternities, 479
the Santo Rostro, 502
indulgence for the royal family, 542
Spanish Succession, war of, 538
Spedizzionieri, 443
Speyer, seven indulgences of, 92
Sraddah, sacrifice for the dead, 320
Stagno, indulgence for the bridge at, 177
State of grace for indulgences, 106
indulgences for the dead, 360
in privileged masses, 370
Statio Sacratissimi Sacramenti, 235
Stationarii, 423

Stations of Rome, 199, 279, 341, 447
regulated by Gregory I., 133
enumerations of, 451, 452
Stephen of Aubesaigne refuses to issue indulgence, 13
Stipend for masses, 328
Stock, St. Simon, his learning, 261
his legend and vision, 262
Suarelli, Bishop, on indulgences, 547
Subiaco, forged charters at, 137
Substitutes for crusaders, 117, 161
can gain the jubilee, 203
Succor for the dead, 318
Sudarium, the, 501
Sufficiency of penance in indulgences, 31
Suffrage or jurisdiction for the dead, 338, 346, 350
Suffrages of the saints, 15
for the damned, 333
Suspension of indulgences during jubilee, 211, 215, 219
exceptions, 222
duration, 224
Sweden, rapacity of indulgence-sellers, 416
Sylvester, St., indulgences for the Holy Places, 74
indulgence for the Lateran, 280
Sylvius on equality of remission, 53
Synods order records of indulgences, 445

TAGGIA, GIOV. DA, indulgences *a culpa*, 77
Tantum valent quantum sonant, 46
Tartar converts, indulgences for, 150
Tartaruch, angel, 299
Tartarus signifies hell, 331
Tax-tables, papal, 183
Teaching religion, indulgences for, 536
Temporalia ordinata ad spiritualia, 97
Temporary indulgences, 567
Teobaldo of Assisi on the Portiuncula, 241
Territorial indulgences, 284
Tertiaries, their indulgences, 235, 462
Portiuncula granted to, 245
their frauds condemned, 555
Tertullian, prayers for the dead, 322
on stations, 447
Testament of Isaac, future punishment, 299
Tests for fictitious indulgences, 562
Tetzel, indulgences for the dead, 352
state of grace, 360
his success, 388
his instructions, 389
his methods, 392
his *Antitheses*, 395
his disgrace and death, 396
Tetzel, his indulgences release from justice, 402
Teutonic Order, its indulgences, 76
its dealings in indulgences, 182
its forgeries, 556
Theatins, their privileged altars, 100
their scapular, 498
Theft to gain jubilee indulgence, 231
Theodoric of Verdun, indulgence for, 56
Theodorus a Spiritu Sancto on *plenissima*, 43
antiquity of jubilee, 195
Theories of origin of indulgences, 5
Theses of Luther, 394
Thiasi, 470
Thibaut of Amiens approves confraternity, 471
Thomas of Cantimpré on remission of *culpa*, 62
Thomas, Friar, on pardoners, 401
Thomas of Walden on fraternity, 17
suffrages for the damned, 335
Tiberius cured by Veronica, 501
Tiem, Wenzel, commissioner of indulgences, 375
Tofi da Bettona, his book placed on the Index, 247
Toledo, Abp. of, is head of cruzada, 434
Santo Rostro in, 503
Toletus, Card., indulgence covers penance due, 33
certainty of indulgences for the dead, 358
Toribio, St, urges sale of cruzada, 429
Tornamala, Bapt., indulgences *a culpa*, 73
days of penance or purgatory, 88
conduct of confessor, 105
performance of penance, 124
episcopal indulgences, 166
indulgences for the dead, 350
Toties quoties indulgences, 92
granted by bishops, 170
Portiuncula is, 249
indulgence of St. Peter's, 456
for Servite churches, 497
of blue scapular, 498
crucifix, 522
Toulouse, C. of, 1229, on confraternities, 472
1590, abuse of indulgences, 571
Toulouse, University of, its indulgence, 283
Tournay, C. of, 1481, indulgences granted, 188
on confraternities, 474
Tours, devotion of the Veronica, 506
C. of, 1533, abuse of indulgences, 571
Trade, indulgences a matter of, 182
Traffic in masses, 328
in indulgenced objects, 509, 513
Trajan released from hell, 329

Transfer of indulgenced objects, 512
Treasure, theory of the, 14
formulated by Hales, 21
accepted by Clement VI., 24
debate as to its constitution, 25
its effect on the remission of sin, 27
on conception of indulgence, 28, 45
on sufficiency of penance, 31
on episcopal power, 36
on souls in purgatory, 38
pope sole guardian of, 37
rejected by Tuscan reformers, 546
affirmed by Pius VI., 548
consolidates papal authority, 582
Trent, C. of, indulgences spring from Christ, 4
action as to fictitious indulgences, 38, 559
value of indulgences, 49
reduces burden of masses, 328
prohibits quæstuarii from preaching, 410
is transferred to Bologna, 411
prohibits quæstuarii, 418
regulates publication of indulgences, 418
final action on indulgences, 421
disregard of its precept of moderation, 442
on confraternities, 477
teaching Christian doctrine, 536
relaxation caused by indulgences, 572
Trèves, exposition of Holy Coat, 515
Tribur, C. of, 895, on funerals, 327
Tridentine Catechism, two judgments, 317
Tridentine confession, purgatory in, 298
Trinità, Sodality of, in jubilees, 215, 482
Trinity, new devotion to the, 480
Order of the, 497
invocation of the, 530
Trisagion, indulgence for, 529
Truce of God, indulgence for, 55, 144
Trullench, definition of indulgence, 36
visits to altars, 118
Tuam, indulgence for, 150

ULRIC of Augsburg, indulgence claimed for, 133
his canonization, 150
Uncertainty of indulgences, 121, 548
for the dead, 358
Unigenitus, Bull, on the treasure, 24, 25
Urban II., his indulgence at Clermont, 9
recognizes episcopal power, 36
indulgence for Roger of Sicily, 57
indulgences ascribed to, 140
indulgence granted by, 141
his consecration of churches, 142
Urban IV. promises remission of sins, 59
Urban IV., crusade against Simon de Montfort, 154
faculties granted to legates, 169
indulgences for Corpus Christi, 187
for St. Peter's, 198
Urban V. on remission of sins, 60
pronounces Portiuncula invalid, 243
indulgence for Card. Albornoz, 283
Urban VI., his indulgences, 64
crusade against Clement VII., 153, 374
indulgences to John of Gaunt, 154
publishes a jubilee, 206
Urban VIII., his jubilee, 219
suspends indulgences, 220, 226
extends the Portiuncula, 245
indulgence for Franciscans, 279
forbids traffic in masses, 328
grant to Monserrat, 368, 520
on *oraculo vivæ vocis*, 461
restricts religious Orders, 573
Utilization of indulgences, 35

VALDÉS, JUAN DE, error as to *culpa*, 78
Valence, C. of, 1248, on confraternities, 473
Valerio, Card., account of jubilee of 1600, 216
Validity of fictitious indulgences, 567
Value of indulgences, 44
dependent on purgatory, 3
Valverde, *Via Crucis* at, 466
Varieties of indulgences, 40
Vatican council, jubilee for, 233
indulgences for, 549
Vega, Juan de la, case of, 328
Venia, 56
Venials, if included in indulgence, 32
remission of *culpa*, 79
questions concerning, 110
Venice, moderate indulgences for, 146
Ventura, jubilee of 1300, 201, 202
Vere pœnitentibus et confessis, 60, 111
Veremund, Patriarch, his indulgence, 162
Vernacle, 504
Veronica, the, 501
portent of its turning over, 184
carried to S Spirito, 189
exhibited in jubilee, 204, 209
indulgences at its exhibition, 279
copies of, 504
miracle in 1849, 505
Vertiz, Joseph Brunon de, case of, 544
Veuillot, Louis, collections for jubilee, 438
Via Crucis, 465
extended to the Church at large, 467
Via Matris, the, 465
Vicarious use of merits, 17

Vicarious satisfaction, use of treasure for, 23
its influence, 337
performance of works, 116
winning of jubilee, 203
of Portiuncula, 249
Victor III., indulgence by, 57
Victor of Tunones on future life, 305
Vidman, Bishop, on the Portiuncula, 251
Vienne, C. of, 1312, on discretion as to penance, 11
on quæstuarii, 62, 291
does not confirm the Carmelites, 260
indulgences for the dead, 339
Villani, Giov , jubilee of 1300, 201, 202
Villani, Matteo, jubilee of 1350, 203
Virgin Mary, her merits in the treasure, 25
her promise to St Simon Stock, 263
cannot pardon *culpa*, 267
cannot grant indulgences, 273
indulgence for rape of, 393
preponderance of her cult, 493, 531
Immaculate Conception of, 539
her function in destroying heresy, 549
her foot, measure of, 566
Virgen del Pilar, indulgence of, 566
Vision, divine, is immediate, 317
of John XXII., 271
of St. Simon Stock, 263
accepted by the Church, 266
limited by the Church, 267
Visitation of Mary, indulgences of Order of, 462
Visits to churches, 118
Viterbo, indulgence by Boniface VIII., 103
Vitrier, Jean, on indulgences, 379
Vitry, Jacques de, on anchorites in Palestine, 254
on St. Patrick's Purgatory, 312
Viva, indulgences for the insane, 82
sufficiency of cause, 99
works not required, 104
disposition of penitent, 114
performance of works, 117
letters of indulgence, 192
alms for indulgences, 441
Viva Vocis Oraculo, grants by, 461
Votos de Santiago, 144
Vows, commutation of, in jubilee, 229
crusading, commutation of, 154

WALAFRID STRABO, on future life, 308
Waldenses reject indulgences, 372
Wealth, advantage of, 103, 349
Weigel on fraternities, 18
episcopal power, 37
Weigel, indulgences *a culpa*, 72
days of penance or purgatory, 88
cumulation of indulgences, 92
sufficiency of cause, 97
state of grace, 108
disposition of penitent, 113
performance of penance, 124
power of general councils, 170
requisites for indulgences, 294
burning candles for the dead, 338
indulgences for the dead, 342
Wenzel, King, supports indulgences, 376
Werner, St., chapel of, indulgence for, 174
Werstemius on purgatory, 297
Wessel, John, of Gröningen, on indulgences, 378
Westminster Abbey, indulgences for, 147
Wickliffe on letters of fraternity, 17
frauds of quæstuarii, 64
opposes indulgences, 153, 374
William of Auxerre explains indulgences, 20
value of indulgences, 44
performance of penance, 123
episcopal indulgences, 165
payment for indulgences, 179
suffrages for the damned, 334
William of Montlun, papal power over *culpa*, 67
indulgences for the dead, 340
William of Paris explains indulgences, 21
performance of penance, 123
episcopal indulgences, 165
objects of indulgences, 178
William of Reims offers an indulgence, 143
William of Rennes, on effect of indulgences, 21
does not know the treasure, 23
proportionate payment, 102
performance of penance, 123
indulgences for the dead, 337
William of Toulouse, indulgence to, 140
William of Ware, release from hell, 330
Wiseman, Card., jubilee of 1825, 218, 575
Witzel, Georg, reunion with Lutherans, 417
Wok v. Waldstein burns papal bull, 376
Wolff, Christian, on indulgences, 543
Women as crusaders, 156
Wood to burn heretics, indulgence for, 178
used in crosses for *Via Crucis*, 468
crosses of, not indulgenced, 511
Wool indispensable for scapulars, 264
Works enjoined for indulgences, 101, 104
performance of, 108, 116
of mercy, indulgences for, 534
Worms, Edict of, 397

XAINTES, church of, its letters of indulgence, 192
indulgence from Leo X., 220
seized by him, 181
indulgence for the dead, 345
indulgence to repair church, 387
Ximenes, Card., opposes St. Peter's indulgence, 386

ZABARELLA, CARD., indulgences for the dead, 242
fictitious indulgences, 568
Zaccaria on *plenissima*, 43
performance of penance, 127
antiquity of jubilee, 195
Zaccaria, expenses of jubilee, 217
suspension during jubilee, 226
Zacchæus on future purgation, 304
Zalfani, Pietro, testifies to the Portiuncula, 240
Zanctornato, profits of cruzada, 432
Zante, Veronica at, 501
Zbinco, Archbp, burns Wickliffe's books, 375
Zeal, effect of on indulgences, 52
Zeno, St., on the resurrection, 300
Zeno, Franc. commissioner under St. Peter's bull, 75, 381
Zerola on *plena* and *plenissima*, 42
jubilee of 1600, 216
on privileged beads, 368
Zeyt Abuzeyt, his conversion, 565

Works by the Same Author.

A HISTORY OF THE INQUISITION OF THE MIDDLE AGES.

In three octavo volumes, per set in cloth, $9.00. (Harper & Brothers, New York.)

This book is in every respect remarkable, very impartial and exclusively based on original sources. It must speedily cast into oblivion most of its predecessors.—*Deutsche Zeitschrift für Geschichtswissenschaft:*

The refutation, by a critical examination of the allegations of their accusers, of the dark charges against the Templars; the striking presentment of the witch-craze; the brilliant study of the life of Joan of Arc, severally are illuminating utterances of high value. Incidentally, also, they serve to illustrate some of the best qualities of Mr. Lea's method and style—his method, in that, while in a sense episodic, they are knit firmly into the fabric of the work; his style, in that they are intense and dramatic without a trace of "fine writing" and without the least sacrifice of purpose for effect.—*New York Critic.*

We would particularly commend, for its brevity as well as clearness, Mr. Lea's exposition of the tendencies of Nominalism and Realism, and his account of Roger Bacon for its liveliness and lucidity. His work is one that we can safely recommend all who are interested in its subject to buy. They will be, in Lord Bacon's phrase, "fuller men" after reading it, and the "fuller men" they are before they read it the better they will like it.—*Spectator.*

The author has neglected nothing to arrive at a profound knowledge of his subject; he has examined the vast literature, general and special, to which the Inquisition and heresy have given birth, and he knows it with exactitude. He has held in his hands the original documents, and when he has been unable to do so himself he has had valuable collaborators in Europe who have consulted the archives for him and collated MSS. Add to this the temperament of an historian, a criticism at once severe and judicious, a real talent of exposition, and you can understand how the author has been able to execute his plan.—*Annales de Bibliographie Théologique.*

AN HISTORICAL SKETCH OF SACERDOTAL CELIBACY IN THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH.

Second and enlarged edition, in one 8vo. volume, cloth, $4.50. (Houghton, Mifflin & Co., Boston.)

Very instructive—not the less so because impartial, uncontroversial and free from all exaggeration on a subject which is naturally not unprovocative of it. It has the proper qualities of a history.—*Westminster Review.*

STUDIES IN CHURCH HISTORY.

The Rise of the Temporal Power—Benefit of Clergy—Excommunication—The Early Church and Slavery. Second edition, revised. In one royal 12mo. volume, cloth, $2.50. (Lea Brothers & Co., Philadelphia.)

They deal at great length and apparently with much care and as the result of long and well-directed research with many of the most interesting controversies of the ancient and medieval Church, and they contain much information which will be new at any rate to all but ecclesiastical scholars.—*London Saturday Review.*

LEA BROTHERS & CO., Publishers, - Philadelphia and New York.

Works by the Same Author.

SUPERSTITION AND FORCE.

Essays on the Wager of Law, the Wager of Battle, the Ordeal and Torture. Fourth and enlarged edition, in one royal 12mo. volume, cloth, $2.75. (Lea Brothers & Co., Philadelphia.)

It is Dr. Lea's glory that he is one of the very few English-speaking men who have had the courage to grapple with the law and the legal documents of Continental Europe. He has looked at them with the naked eye, instead of seeing them—a much easier task—through German spectacles. We trust him thoroughly because he keeps his gaze fixed on the middle ages and never looks around for opinions to be refuted or for quarrels to be picked. This is not exactly the policy that we could recommend to any but a strong man. Dr. Lea, however, is strong and sober and wary.—*English Historical Review.*

CHAPTERS FROM THE RELIGIOUS HISTORY OF SPAIN CONNECTED WITH THE INQUISITION.

Censorship of the Press—Mystics and Illuminati—Endemoniadas—El Santo Nino de la Guardia—Brianda de Bardaxi. In one royal 12mo. volume, cloth, $2.50. (Lea Brothers & Co., Philadelphia.)

After attentively reading the work one does not know whether the author is a Catholic, a Protestant, or a Free Thinker. This moderation deprives the indictment of none of its force. The facts and the documents, of which the number and novelty attest a patient erudition, are grouped in luminous order and produce on the reader an effect all the more powerful that it seems the less designed. When we add that the style is in every way excellent, that it is clear, sober and precise, we do full justice to a work which reflects the highest honor on the talents of the writer and on the methods of the modern school of history.—*Revue Critique d' Histoire et de Littérature.*

A FORMULARY OF THE PAPAL PENITENTIARY IN THE THIRTEENTH CENTURY.

In one octavo volume, cloth, $2.50. (Lea Brothers & Co., Philadelphia.)

Mr. Lea is entitled to our gratitude for adding this volume to the long list of his historical works. The use which he has already made of it in the introduction, of which we have endeavored to reproduce the special features, sufficiently demonstrates its value. Everyone will doubtless agree with us that such a publication is well deserving of a place among the original texts which elucidate the history of the Church on one of its most curious and complex sides.—*Revue Historique.*

IN PREPARATION.

A HISTORY OF THE INQUISITION OF SPAIN.

Largely based on original documents.

LEA BROTHERS & CO., Publishers, - Philadelphia and New York.

DATE DUE

MAY 13 1969

JAN 30 1973

SEP 30 1986

OCT 14 1986

OCT 28 1986

DOMINICAN COLLEGE LIBRARY
BX2265 .L4 v.3
Lea, Henry C/A history of auricular conf
3 3645 00049956 9

41117

BX2265 .L42 1896
v.3
Lea, Henry Charles,
1825-1909.
A history of auricular
confession and indulgences
in the Latin church

San Rafael, California